

vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Thomas Boylan, Jr., of Pennsylvania.  
David C. Cuthell, of Connecticut.  
Robert D. Davis, of Oklahoma.  
John B. Dexter, of Maryland.  
Leon G. Dorros, of New York.  
John N. Gatch, Jr., of Ohio.  
Andrew W. Green, of Pennsylvania.  
Norman B. Hannah, of Illinois.  
Gergory Henderson, of Massachusetts.  
William W. Kaufmann, of New York.  
John Keppel, of the District of Columbia.  
Richard M. McCarthy, of Iowa.  
Francis T. McCoy, of Florida.  
Ellwood M. Rabenold, Jr., of Pennsylvania.  
John W. Rozler, of Georgia.  
Samuel O. Ruff, of North Carolina.  
William E. Scott, of Illinois.  
Ernest L. Stanger, of Utah.  
William Perry Stedman, Jr., of Maryland.  
Philip H. Valdes, of New York.  
Theodore A. Wahl, of New York.  
Stephen Winship, of Massachusetts.

#### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Irving J. Higbee, of New York, to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York. (Mr. Higbee is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 16, 1947.)

#### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Loomis E. Cranor, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky. (Mr. Cranor is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires June 14, 1947.)

#### DISTRICT ATTORNEY, DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Francisco Corneiro, of the Virgin Islands, to be district attorney for the District Court of the Virgin Islands, vice James A. Bough, resigned.

#### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidate for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of oath of office:  
Lydia B. Edwards

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Surgeon to be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):  
Hiram J. Bush

Senior dental surgeon to be dental director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel):  
Stanmore P. Marshall

#### APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

##### TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Cranford Coleman Bryan Warden, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from August 4, 1944.

Maj. Robert Loomis Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1946.

Maj. Thomas Edward Pickett Barbour, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1943.

##### TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. Nelson Marquis Lynde, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1946.

##### TO AIR CORPS

Lt. Col. Gilbert Hayden, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1945.

Maj. George Harold Graham, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from November 9, 1946.

Maj. Harold Elworthy Todd, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 20, 1945.

Capt. Henry James Heuer, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from January 13, 1947.

Capt. Robert Muirhead Reed, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 17, 1940.

First Lt. Earl Morse Bradford, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from January 11, 1943.

First Lt. William Kneedler Cummins, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Frederick Charles Engelman, Finance Department (temporary major), with rank from December 7, 1944.

First Lt. Edgar Max McGinnis, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 10, 1944.

First Lt. Edward Blakslee Reed, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 14, 1944.

First Lt. Milton Frederick Ritterbush, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 11, 1941.

First Lt. Joe Neal Swanger, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from November 10, 1945.

First Lt. Robert Andrew Wys, Chemical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from October 26, 1944.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

To Thee, our Father, out of the busy voices of life, we lift our breath in prayer. In Thy providential guidance Thou hast not dealt more tenderly with any other nation; therefore, make us humble and grateful, and lift us to the realization that, if our country is to be saved, it must serve with emphasis the spiritual and moral values. Keep in our remembrance that life consists not in the abundance of things we possess.

Today, bowed in the shadows of tragic sorrows, we see many hopes and prospects tragically shattered. We pray for Thy special comfort and peace to abide with the valiant ones who suffer from the inexorable uncertainties of fate. In the viewless light of stricken homes, O nourish them with all Thy goodness, and when their sunset pales to dusk, give them Thy hand that bids all weary ones to rest.

"There is a Power whose care  
Teaches thy way along that pathless coast,

The desert and illimitable air,  
Lone wandering, but not lost.

\* \* \* \* \*  
He who, from zone to zone,  
Guides through the boundless sky  
thy certain flight,  
In the long way that I must tread alone,  
Will lead my steps aright."

Hear us, O Lord, and give us Thy peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 13, 1947, was read and approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were com-

municated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 28, 1947:

H. R. 2102. An act to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, and

H. R. 2413. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

On April 30, 1947:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to restore the name of Hoover Dam.

On June 14, 1947:

H. R. 1288. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant a private right-of-way to Roscoe L. Wood.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from the Daily Jefferson County Union of Fort Atkinson, Wis.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a newspaper item.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record in two instances and include some editorial and news material.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address made by Edward F. Poss, past grand worthy president of the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Seattle Times.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial entitled "A Fairy Tale Forms."

#### SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution calling for the appointment by the Speaker of a select committee to investigate the national housing shortage. It is shocking and inexcusable that the critical housing shortage should be allowed to go unchallenged almost 2 years after the ending of the war. I believe that the vast majority of the American people are tired of labor, industry, and government bickering about who is guilty in "the case of the missing home."

Mr. Speaker, I am the sponsor in the House of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, H. R. 2523, the only comprehensive housing measure seeking to do something about the housing shortage, but I am by now convinced that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House does not plan to hold hearings on this measure this session—though I asked for them as long ago as April 26—and in any case the facts developed by the proposed investigation are essential to the effective functioning of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill when enacted.

The Committee on Banking and Currency may well believe that private enterprise will within the next 6 months make the turn upward from the disastrously low point of housing construction where we now stand. Whether or not this be a vain hope, whether excessive costs of building materials and labor and unduly restrictive municipal building codes make it impossible for private enterprise to do the job under present conditions for the moderate- and low-income groups, will be determined while Congress is in recess. Unless we authorize this investigation, we will be charged with completely neglecting America's No. 1 domestic problem at a time when its solution hangs in the balance. We will be coming back here, not to enact a high-priority emergency program if the situation continues to be as catastrophic as it is now, but we will be arguing about where to place the blame.

Mr. Speaker, this investigation of America's No. 1 domestic problem is Congress' No. 1 domestic must.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and that they be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### TERMINAL-LEAVE BONDS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, it is rumored that the President intends to veto the tax bill, and it is also the general understanding that it will not be possible to override his veto; therefore I want to make a suggestion, particularly to the leadership on my side of the aisle, and that is this, that we immediately arrange to pay or make negotiable the terminal-leave bonds that were given to the GI's who served this country during the war. That is an obligation of the Government, it is an obligation that should be met, and we can make

them negotiable so that those who need the money can cash in their bonds and those who want to retain the bonds and draw interest for the 5 years can do so. In that way we will be paying off on the debt and we will be meeting the obligations of the men who served in the armed forces.

On January 3, I introduced H. R. 170 which provided for the payment of terminal leave bonds for those who need the money. I am urging that the bill introduced by myself or some similar measure be reported by the committee and submitted to the House for action before the adjournment of the present session of Congress. This law should be enacted before we adjourn.

#### CONFERRING OF HONORARY DEGREE UPON SPEAKER MARTIN

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Tufts College bestowed upon our distinguished and beloved Speaker the honorary degree of doctor of laws. Two weeks ago he was awarded the same degree by the Pennsylvania Military College, and last month he was made a doctor of civil law by Boston University.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend to you congratulations on these academic honors that recently have been bestowed upon you.

Such honors come to few men. They are a recognition of the outstanding contribution you have made, and continue to make, to the welfare of our great country. They attest to your ability. And, more than that, Mr. Speaker, they attest to the intellectual honesty, high purpose, and devotion to God and country with which you have applied the exceptional talents that are yours.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I express the unanimous sentiment of this House when I say we are proud of you. It is a great privilege to serve in this body, as a Representative of the people. And we can be sure that so long as men of your character and ability are selected to preside there will always be a House of Representatives where the rights of all the people, of whatever political faith, will find protection.

In the fullest sense of the word, Mr. Speaker, you are one of the Nation's great. Those who honor you bring honor to themselves. In congratulating you we are congratulating ourselves in having you as our presiding officer.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to say that every word uttered by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], is echoed by me and every Member on this side of the aisle. It makes us proud of the institution of which we are a part that we have as the

head of that institution a man who deserves these high and distinguished honors.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased with the honors conferred upon our Speaker, and more particularly because of the honor conferred by Boston University, because that makes the distinguished Speaker and myself both honorary degree men of that great university.

As the gentleman from Indiana well said, the honor conferred upon the Speaker is one that is, in fact, conferred upon the entire House. The gentleman from Massachusetts, our distinguished Speaker [Mr. MARTIN], is beloved by every Member of the House regardless of party. Throughout the many years of our association, myself a Democrat and the Speaker a Republican, there has been a most profound feeling of respect on my part for him and a strong feeling of friendship, which I know is reciprocated by him.

I join with our distinguished majority leader in the fine words of commendation that he has expressed, and in the expression of appreciation to these great universities for the deserved recognition that they have conferred upon our distinguished and beloved Speaker.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I have had the honor, pleasure, and distinction of serving under nine different Speakers. They were all great Americans, patriotic, honorable men. I did not at all times agree with all of them, but I feel that they were fair and conducted themselves as real men. With all the love that I have had for many of the Democratic Speakers, I want to say that our present Speaker, JOE MARTIN, undoubtedly will be recognized by history as a fair and firm presiding officer who reflects credit on his high office. I join with the gentleman from Indiana, the gentleman from Texas, and the gentleman from Massachusetts in congratulating the Speaker upon the honor that has been given him, and I hope it will not be the last one that will be his.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to add just a word to what has been said. I have never known a man to preside over this House with more ability and impartiality than our present Speaker.

He is a great American. He is rendering a great service to his country and he richly deserves the honors that have been bestowed upon him.

#### AIR ACCIDENTS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce whose unhappy duty it is to make investigations of air accidents, may I say that we are very much concerned over the accident which occurred last Friday evening. Let me also say for the benefit of the Members of the House that in these three accidents which have occurred recently there is no apparent similarity. I, myself, cannot see as yet any apparent reason for condemning any aircraft or personnel. However, the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman will do what it can to learn as rapidly as possible the cause of this third of a series of accidents and to make any recommendations that we may feel desirable.

#### AIR SAFETY

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, President Truman yesterday named a five-man special fact-finding board to make an investigation into air safety. The members of the board are Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; Brig. Gen. M. W. Arnold, vice president of the Air Transport Association; James M. Landis, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; H. B. Cox, American Air Lines pilot; and Theodore P. Wright, Civil Aeronautics Administrator.

As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that in the course of the committee's extensive hearings on air safety the committee has had occasion to hear the testimony of all of these men or representatives of the organizations which they represent. The committee heard both Mr. Landis and Mr. Wright, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, respectively. Mr. John W. Crowley, Jr., acting director of research, appeared before the committee on behalf of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. General Arnold, as well as Mr. Ramspeck, a former Member of this House, appeared on behalf of the Air Transport Association. Finally, the Air Line Pilots Association was represented by its president, David L. Behncke, and members of the association employed by different air lines appeared; Ernest A. Cutrell, American Airlines; Robert N. Buck, Transworld; J. E. Wood, Eastern Air Lines, in addition to John M. Dickinson and Brant W. Phillips, appeared before this committee and gave testimony.

It will be the purpose of this committee to make available to the new investigating board appointed by the President all of the testimony and other information supplied to this committee by over a hundred witnesses who appeared in the course of the committee's air-safety investigation. It is my fervent hope that the new board will be able to further add to our knowledge as to how to prevent recurrences of these accidents.

I assure the House that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will continue its own investigation, of all air accidents in recent months, and, of course, include those that have so recently happened.

It is expected that the committee will be in a position to make a report on the over-all study it has made within the next 2 weeks or so.

#### WEATHER OVER THE WATER GATE

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today is a most unusual day in the history of weather. At the risk of infringing upon the prerogatives of the Weather Bureau, I should like to give an entirely unofficial but likely prognostication of the meteorological conditions to be expected in this city for the next 24 hours.

A low-pressure area is expected to reach Washington early this evening, accompanied by mounting temperatures. It will center at Water Gate, on the Potomac, and will be accompanied by high winds, blowing alternately hot and cold. Freezing temperatures can be expected in the vicinity of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and on the minority side of the House of Representatives. Silver clouds will be in evidence, turning a deeper red about nightfall. Gentle variable winds emanating in eastern Europe will increase to tornado proportions and all loose items in the way of foreign policy and dollar credits should be battered down. Tomorrow, fair and warmer.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, at the annual dinner of the New Jersey Bar Association last Saturday evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Rotarian.

#### LEWIS DESCHLER, DOCTOR OF LAWS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1947, the honorary degree of doctor of laws was conferred upon the Honorable Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, by the National University School of Law. The ceremony conferring this degree upon Mr. Deschler was held at the United States Chamber of Commerce Building, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

George P. Barse, as chancellor of the National University, in conferring upon Mr. Deschler the honorary degree of doctor of laws, had the following to say:

At this point I take pleasure in presenting the Honorable Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, as a candidate for the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. Deschler has held the office of Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives for more than 20 years. Appointment to that high office is personal with each Speaker elected by the House, and the fact that Mr. Deschler has served continuously during a period of more than 20 years demonstrates his outstanding ability and qualifications for that office and the efficiency with which he performs his duties. During his term of office and up to the present time the following have been Speakers of the House: Hon. Nicholas Longworth, Hon. John N. Garner, Hon. Henry T. Rainey, Hon. Joseph W. Byrnes, Hon. William B. Bankhead, Hon. Sam Rayburn, Hon. Joseph W. Martin.

Some of the outstanding phases of his record as parliamentarian are:

He is editor and coauthor of Rules and Practices of the House of Representatives, which, combined with an edited Jefferson's Manual and an annotated Constitution of the United States, constitute an official publication of the House of Representatives.

He is the source of the additional material used in maintaining the present and future editions of Hind's Precedents, which in parliamentary law, occupies a place similar to the Reports of the Supreme Court.

He is recognized in the United States as an expert in parliamentary law, and, in addition to his services as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, his opinions and interpretations of problems of a parliamentary nature arising in the States of the United States are often requested, respected, and followed.

His services to this country during the past two decades have been of great importance in that during that period there developed unusual legislative and parliamentary problems arising from the prolonged depression of the late 1920's and the early years of the next decade; the reconstruction period thereafter; the prewar period of the last world war and the years of that war, as well as the reconstruction phases following the war, which have not as yet been completed.

Mr. Deschler is no stranger to National University. He was formerly a student here and took the required courses leading to the degree of J. D. and M. P. L., which were conferred upon him in 1932. In order to receive these degrees he had to attain and maintain better than average grades in the subjects and courses pursued by him. I may say at this point, that I had the pleasure of having

Mr. Deschler as a student in some of the courses taught by me at this university during the years he was working for his degrees.

Mr. Deschler, by authority of the board of trustees of National University, I take pleasure in conferring upon you the degree of doctor of laws.

#### AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNISM

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, following the remarks of the gentleman from California, I wish to state that we are now spending \$400,000,000 to stop communism in Greece and Turkey while the Secretary of State is now preparing a program whereby it has been announced that in a few years we are going to spend \$25,000,000,000 more. While we are doing that overseas in all of the countries in the world, tonight one of the leading Communist-front organizations is using Federal Government facilities to propagate their propaganda. They are being allowed to use a Federal facility for a springboard so that throughout the world they will be recognized as speaking officially for the Government of the United States of America.

A few days ago we had a report by the Committee on Un-American Activities describing the true character of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, one of the most leading and most conspicuous Communist-front organizations within our borders. Yet that organization today, this evening, is using Federal property and Federal facilities at the expense of the taxpayers to propagate their propaganda to the people of America and to the people of the world.

To me, it appears that we are the laughing stock of the universe, spending billions of dollars to stop communism abroad, but embracing them in official circles and allowing them to use Federal Government facilities for their propaganda. What a travesty on the taxpayers of America to dish out billions to stop communism everywhere except in the United States of America. This is proof that the present demonstration hates communism in Europe—but it loves communism in the United States of America.

#### FATHER O'DONNELL AND NOTRE DAME

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the South Bend Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a telegram, late Thursday evening, from Father John J. Cavanaugh, president of the University of Notre Dame, brought

the sad announcement that had been expected for several days.

The Reverend J. Hugh O'Donnell, wartime president of Notre Dame, had passed away at the infirmary on the campus that he loved so well.

From prep-school days, through the university as an outstanding student and athlete during the undergraduate days of the immortal Knute Rockne, during his years in the priesthood, culminated by his two illustrious terms as president of the university, the life of Father O'Donnell is the history of the growth of Notre Dame during the past 35 years.

In his passing, Notre Dame and the Nation have lost one of the truly great men of our times, and at a time when we can ill afford to lose them.

The life of Father O'Donnell is best portrayed in the following story from the South Bend Tribune of June 13, 1947. It follows:

#### DEATH CLOSES O'DONNELL'S LONG CAREER—NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY'S WARTIME CHIEF DIES AT 52

Rev. J. Hugh O'Donnell, C. S. C., former president of the University of Notre Dame, who guided the institution through the trying period of World War II and saw it reach its largest enrollment in history, died in the infirmary at the university at 5 p. m., Tuesday.

Details of the funeral had not been worked out early this afternoon except that it will be held at 10 o'clock Monday morning in Sacred Heart Church on the campus with burial in the community cemetery at Notre Dame.

The body of Father O'Donnell was taken to the McGann funeral home. It will be returned to the university Saturday afternoon and will lie in state in the parlors in the main building until the hour of the funeral. Members of the lay faculty club and the Knights of Columbus are arranging an honor guard.

Death came to the 52-year-old administrator, scholar, and orator after a long illness, the seriousness of which first became apparent last February. At that time his ill health halted his preparations to embark on a mission for the Congregation of Holy Cross to visit its establishments in South America.

#### EXAMINED AT CLINIC

A subsequent examination in a clinic in Rochester, Minn., disclosed that Father O'Donnell was suffering from cancer. He returned to the university and had remained bedfast most of the time as his health steadily declined.

At his bedside when death came were members of his immediate family, Mrs. Gertrude Graziani, a sister, of Chicago; Dr. Frank J. O'Donnell, a brother, and Mrs. O'Donnell and their two children, Patricia and Michael O'Donnell, all of Alpena, Mich.

Also in the room were a number of the clergy, including the recently consecrated Bishop Lawrence L. Graner, C. S. C., of Dacca, India; Rev. Thomas Steiner, C. S. C., provincial of the Congregation of the Holy Cross; Rev. Christopher O'Toole, C. S. C., and Rev. Kerndt Healy, C. S. C., assistant provincials; Rev. Matthew Walsh, C. S. C., former president of Notre Dame; Rev. John H. Murphy, C. S. C., vice president of the university; Rev. Thomas P. Irving, C. S. C., professor of religion, and Rev. Richard J. Grimm, C. S. C., superior of Holy Cross Seminary. Rev. John J. Cavanaugh, C. S. C., president of the university, was in Providence, R. I., where he gave the commencement address at Provi-

dence College. He left immediately for South Bend.

Last rites of the church were administered to Father O'Donnell about 10 days ago when his condition took a sudden turn for the worse. Father O'Toole gave the last blessing to him as he died.

#### COGNIZANT OF CONDITION

Father O'Donnell was fully cognizant of his condition and accepted his fate stoically. He was in Detroit, Mich., when first stricken with what appeared to be an attack of jaundice. Upon the advice of his brother he went to the Mayo clinic in Rochester, where an operation disclosed that he was suffering from cancer of the pancreas.

Because of the shock of the operation to his system he was not told that he was suffering from cancer until after his return to the infirmary at Notre Dame a few weeks later. Then two of his closest friends, Father Steiner and Father Walsh, visited him one day and as sparingly as possible told him the nature of his disease and that he had only a few months to live.

Father O'Donnell told them that he had suspected his condition, but had hoped that it was not true. Then after a few moments he asked the two priests to accompany him to the infirmary chapel while he made an act of resignation.

From that time until his death he maintained a cheerful outlook and welcomed visitors to his room. During his illness he kept up a steady correspondence with the hundreds of friends, former students, members of the clergy and business associates who wrote him messages of cheer. Until several weeks ago he dictated personal replies.

#### AT NOTRE DAME 35 YEARS

With the exception of 3 years when he was president of St. Edward's university, Austin Texas, Father O'Donnell was associated practically uninterruptedly with Notre Dame's activities for 35 years. Leaving St. Edward's in 1934, he came to Notre Dame as vice-president. He served in that capacity until January, 1940, when he was advanced to the acting presidency.

At that time he succeeded Most Rev. John F. O'Hara, C. S. C., D. D., who resigned to become supervising bishop of the United States army and navy diocese. Father O'Donnell was appointed president by the provincial council of the priests of the Congregation of Holy Cross in July, 1940, and was renamed for another 3-year term in July 1943.

Father O'Donnell relinquished the presidency in July, 1946, and was succeeded by Father Cavanaugh, who had been serving as vice-president. Since his retirement Father O'Donnell had served in an advisory capacity to university officials. In recognition of his many years of service he was awarded an honorary doctor of laws at the recent commencement exercises.

#### LED NEW ACTIVITY

Under the leadership of Father O'Donnell, Notre Dame embarked on an entirely new phase of educational activity during the war. More than 25,000 of the Nation's young men received training on the campus for service as officers in the United States Navy. Nearly 12,000 were commissioned as ensigns, a total greater than the officer strength of the Regular Navy at the start of World War II.

It was chiefly through Father O'Donnell's efforts that the naval reserve officers' training corps, the V-12 program and the midshipmen school were established on the campus and utilized facilities of the university in their training.

Meanwhile, the laboratory facilities of the university were employed for special research in atomic energy, chemistry, metallurgy, aeronautics, and other scientific endeavors in behalf of the Government. Thirty-six



members of the faculty left Notre Dame either to join the armed forces or for research in direct connection with the war effort.

#### PROBLEMS COMPLICATED

From the end of the war until his retirement, Father O'Donnell's postwar problems at the university were complicated by a large influx of war veterans seeking to begin or continue their educations. Notre Dame's normal enrollment of 3,200 jumped to 4,500 in his last semester as president, mainly because of students returning from the war.

As a private institution, Notre Dame normally receives no aid from the Federal or State Governments. Therefore, it must depend on the generosity of its friends, both Catholic and non-Catholic, to help meet its annual deficits.

To aid in increasing the university's endowment, smallest for any institution of comparable size in the United States, Father O'Donnell directed the establishment of a department of public relations in 1941. The endowment was increased from \$1,000,000 to \$3,650,000 in his presidency.

Father O'Donnell also worked toward the expansion of Notre Dame's graduate school. In the spring of 1946 the medieval institute was established to provide a medium of study for graduate students in the early civilization and Christian culture of the Western World. He appointed Rev. Gerald B. Phelan, founder and director of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto, Canada, as the director of the institute at Notre Dame.

#### BORN IN GRAND RAPIDS

Father O'Donnell was born June 2, 1895, in Grand Rapids, Mich., and entered Notre Dame in 1912 as an undergraduate student. He was the son of the late Edward J. and Sarah A. (O'Grady) O'Donnell.

Father O'Donnell was a star athlete and honor student in his undergraduate career at Notre Dame. He won a monogram on the football team in 1915.

After receiving a bachelor of literature degree at Notre Dame in 1915 he entered the seminary of the Congregation of Holy Cross. On December 28, 1921, he was ordained to the Catholic priesthood in Sacred Heart Seminary, Grand Rapids, by Most Rev. Edward D. Kelly, D. D., then bishop of that diocese. The next year Father O'Donnell received a doctor of philosophy degree at Catholic University, Washington, D. C., where he specialized in American church history.

In the spring of 1923 he was named rector of Badin Hall on the Notre Dame campus. In 1924 he became prefect of discipline and supervisor of student activities, a post which he held until 1931, when he went to St. Edward's to become president.

#### ON NATIONAL BROADCAST

Father O'Donnell was a pioneer in the early work of the Catholic Students Mission crusade, which antedated the current Catholic Youth Organization in this country. He was an active member of the American Catholic Historical Association, serving on its executive council 2 years. He also was a contributor to the Catholic Historical Review and other periodicals. He spoke on the Catholic Hour and Church of the Air radio programs and other national broadcasts during his presidency and addressed various clubs and forums.

Father O'Donnell was named by the late President Roosevelt to serve on the Board of Visitors of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., in 1942 and 1943. He was a member of the Federal Government's Committee on Postwar Science and was a trustee and member of the executive council of the Nutrition Foundation.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein three editorials.

#### CONDUCT OF EMPLOYEES OF COMMON CARRIERS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege from time to time to travel about this country and unofficially arrive on busses, planes, trains, and boats as an ordinary common citizen. I am convinced that common carriers, hauling human cargo, have lost a considerable degree, and perhaps an overwhelming percentage, of their respect for the traveling public. The personnel from the low to high in those industries, in my opinion, no longer look upon the traveling public as a great part of their institution. There is too much carelessness, there is too much inattention, there is too much ignoring of the fact that handling human cargo is a delicate operation which requires sobriety, above all, and common sense, and a friendly attitude to those who travel. This applies all the way along the line from the ground crews to the pilots who fly at the highest levels. All I know about the airplane industry is to ride a plane and pay my fare. I am afraid that when you get to the bottom of these accidents you will find a great deal of it is due to bad personnel. I hope the committees will not overlook that phase in their investigation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

#### FLOODS IN IOWA

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the most disastrous flood in the history of the State of Iowa came in torrents down several rivers in Iowa last week, reaching flood stage above the high-water mark, with a loss of at least 6 lives at the city of Ottumwa, Iowa. That city of thirty-five or forty thousand is suffering a recurrence of that flood at this very moment, with one-third of the city under water, and 10,000 people driven from their homes.

In 1944, the Army engineers made a survey of the Des Moines River valley and estimated that floods could be controlled at an outlay for dams and levees of \$15,000,000. Probably the estimate now would go to \$20,000,000, but the property loss alone in the city of Ottumwa is \$10,000,000 at the present moment, with uncounted millions of dollars lost to crop lands in the rich Des Moines River valley.

I ask the Appropriations Committee to consider the situation at this very time. I have invited the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and members of this committee to visit Iowa and see the destruction from flood waters at this very moment.

Other towns, notably Eddyville, a flourishing community of 1,000 persons, is entirely under water, with every man, woman, and child forced to higher ground.

The American Red Cross, as well as the Navy personnel stationed at the Ottumwa Naval Air Station, has performed valuable service in this emergency with first-aid equipment and with serum to prevent an epidemic. The city water supply of Ottumwa has been cut off entirely and drinking water has been supplied by towns from as far away as 75 miles.

Millions of acres of cropland in southern Iowa will have to be almost entirely replanted and this is the area that produces a great deal of the food of the country, notably corn, hogs, cattle, sheep, and poultry. Undoubtedly the effects of this disaster will be felt throughout the country.

I repeat that this country cannot afford a repetition of the flood disaster in this rich producing area of our country. We must proceed with flood control measures.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

#### VETO OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am told there lies upon the Speaker's table the President's veto message of the tax bill. If this is true, then there remains but one thing for the President to do to completely dissipate the cloud upon which leans his ladder of hope, and that is to veto the labor bill.

#### RETIREMENT FOR FBI PERSONNEL

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, within a short time the House will consider H. R. 2826, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service.

Every Member of this House knows of the efficiency of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In a matter of a few years it has become the greatest law-enforcing body in the world. It has served the country well both in peace

and in war. It is a law-enforcing organization with character.

The House should bear in mind that the entrance requirements both physical and mental for the Federal Bureau of Investigation are much higher than those of either West Point or Annapolis. Not only must the applicant be a college graduate, he must also be the possessor of a life that will stand the most rigid investigation. The work, itself, for both Director and agents, requires a 24-hour day and a 7-day week. The Federal Bureau of Investigation agent and his family know no holidays. They have become acquainted with the fact that they cannot plan any leisure or social life 24 hours in advance. The work requires long and frequent absences from the family fireside. The morning never knows what the night will bring. It is a life of peril and sacrifice. I have not the slightest doubt that the men in this Bureau with 10 years of service have worked more hours in that time than the average Federal worker will in 30 years of service. It is a field for youth and youth alone. The men who are in the service know that after they reach the age of 45 or 50 their usefulness to the Bureau and to the country is limited. It is but natural that these men must look to their future and for the security of their families. Due to the fine reputation that the Bureau has, private industry is constantly trying to recruit Federal Bureau of Investigation men. Each time that a member of the Bureau resigns and goes into private industry, it is a distinct loss to our people. We are losing the training and valuable experience of a man who is absolutely needed in the firing line in the ever-present war against the criminal elements. Many of the men who leave the service, leave solely because of the lack of security they have under the existing pension system. They like the work and they know that they will miss the wonderful esprit de corps that has been developed by their Chief, J. Edgar Hoover, yet they know the limitations of the service and feel that they must protect their families.

If this bill is passed it will keep many good men in the service, for they will know that middle age will no longer mean insecurity. It is my sincere hope that this House will pass the bill.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by John L. King, radio and research director of the Washington State Grange.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] at a rally in Brooklyn last Wednesday.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appen-

dix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution from the General Assembly of Rhode Island.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Atlanta Journal.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include this morning's broadcast by George E. Reedy relating to air accidents.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Southwest American published at Fort Smith, Ark.

Mr. KERR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a very able editorial from the News Observer of Raleigh, N. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the former head of the Petroleum Administration, Mr. Ralph K. Davies.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 15 minutes today following the order of business for the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

#### DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give testimony to the patriotism, the high character, and splendid worth of Dr. Frank Porter Graham, president of the University of North Carolina.

I say, without hesitation, mental reservation, or secret evasion of mind that he is one of the outstanding men of the Nation. He is not a Communist nor a fellow traveler, nor a Communist sympathizer. He is a great American, a man of the highest caliber and character, and as patriotic as will be found anywhere. He measures up to the highest standards of citizenship.

#### SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to read a message I received from Clark Foreman, president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down. He cannot get up on the floor of the House and read a vicious attack on Members of Congress like that. If he is not willing to withdraw it and take it out of the RECORD, I am going to move that it be stricken from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California ask consent to withdraw the telegram?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not consider that this message should be withdrawn.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman objecting to the words in the telegram?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; the words read from the telegram.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read the words objected to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair feels that the last sentence is unparliamentary. It says, "We completely repudiate the lies and half-truths of the report that was issued and consider it un-American." Those words reflect upon the character and integrity of the membership of a committee and, the Chair feels, are unparliamentary.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the entire statement from the RECORD, and on that I ask for recognition.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have already been recognized.

The SPEAKER. A motion to table is preferential and not debatable.

The question is upon the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] that the motion be tabled.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York had previously asked for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 10, noes 147.

So the motion to table was rejected.

#### REPORT ON SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE—HENRY WALLACE'S SPEECH

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time within the last few days



the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has taken the floor to directly or indirectly attack the Committee on Un-American Activities; a committee that has taken more abuse from the un-American elements in this country than any other committee that has ever been created by the Congress of the United States; a committee that is rendering one of the greatest services this House has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read from a speech that has been much publicized. Tonight, Henry Agard Wallace will probably repeat his attacks made in California down here at the Water Gate. Looking down on that will be the monuments of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, and Robert E. Lee. I would love to know their reactions. If they could all speak, I am sure they would all manifest their disapproval—especially if he followed his usual line.

Mr. Wallace went out to California recently and made a speech, and somebody had it rebroadcast over the radio. I sent for the transcript, and I want to read you just a few words from that speech to let you know what kind of a battle we are in in this country:

Among other things, Mr. Wallace said—now listen to this:

We branded ourselves forever in the eyes of the world, for the murder by the state of two humble and glorious immigrants—Sacco and Vanzetti.

He is referring to those two criminal anarchists that were executed by the State of Massachusetts after they had been convicted in a fair and impartial trial, and after the State had leaned backward and had the case reinvestigated by impartial judges. Then he goes on and he proceeds to say:

We had to relearn—

This is Mr. Wallace speaking—

We had to relearn the meaning of democracy from the contrast between our own cowardice and the courage of these men.

These acts today fill us with burning shame—

Says Mr. Wallace:

Now other men seek to fasten new shame upon America.

I speak of only one source of shame to decent Americans who want their country to be admired by the world. I mean the group of bigots first known as the Dies committee, then the Rankin committee, now the Thomas committee—three names for Fascists the world over to roll on their tongues with pride.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I would send for a psychiatrist or not if a man made that statement in my presence, but it sounds like the ravings of a maniac. I cannot understand how anybody could make that statement in the light of what is going on and what has gone on in the past.

He brands me as being the very opposite of Sacco and Vanzetti; and I am delighted to acknowledge the soft impeachment.

What we are trying to do is to save our country from being undermined by those communistic elements that are today trying to debase America, destroy our Government, destroy Christianity, destroy freedom, and reduce Americans to communistic slavery as they have done elsewhere.

They make an attack on us for trying to turn back the tide in Hollywood, where attempts are being made by some elements to drag the American moral standard down to the level of Sodom and Gomorrah.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] gets up here and defends Mr. Frank Graham. I say to him that all the Members from North Carolina do not share his illusion about Mr. Graham, neither do the white people throughout the Southern States and the better elements of the Negroes in the South share that illusion. If he were the great patriot he claims to be, he would not be mixed up with this red front organization that is stirring race trouble all over the Southern States.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The man, Clark Foreman, referred to in the telegram the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] read, hails from my State. If he is not a Communist or a fellow traveler, he performs like one; and that which I say with respect to him I say with respect to Dr. Graham of the University of North Carolina.

Mr. RANKIN. The South has gone through many travails in the last 85 years. She has known the terrors of war and the bitterness of defeat. She has known the horrors of reconstruction and the struggles through depressions. In those old days of reconstruction, the worst enemy the South had was what we called the scalawags, the local men who turned against us and tried to make personal or political capital by abusing and misrepresenting and undermining the people of the Southern States.

That is exactly what this Southern Conference for Human Welfare is doing today. It is full of these scalawags. This committee branded it correctly when they said it is a Communist-front organization. It is trying to undermine and destroy everything on which this Government is based, trying to undermine and destroy the American way of life, and using the high-sounding names of a few men like Clark Foreman, Frank Graham, and Aubrey Williams and others who ought to know better, and do know better, to deceive the public.

Mr. Speaker, from this statement of Henry Wallace you can see that it is not sectional. He turns and maligns the State of Massachusetts, and in other portions of his speech he maligns the Southern States. If that is what we are going to have at the hands of these mugwumps, these parlor pinks, these left-wing fellow travelers, and these scallawags, it is about time that we turned the pitiless sunlight

of merciless publicity upon them and let the American people know who they are and what they are up to. Let the American people know that our brave boys who fought and died in this war to preserve our freedom and our form of government did not die in vain; let them know that these boys who have come back wounded, maimed, and blind, and disabled have not offered their services in vain; let them know that the suffering fathers and mothers did not shed their tears in vain when we told them that we were fighting to preserve American institutions and the American way of life.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. COX. While it is true that the Committee on Un-American Activities has been subjected to much abuse, should not the gentleman find comfort in the fact that no committee of the House of Representatives in all of its history ever carried on more completely supported by the membership of the House? I want the gentleman's committee given money sufficient to investigate communism in our public schools and colleges.

Mr. RANKIN. There has never been a committee, a controversial committee, in all the history of Congress that has been more thoroughly supported by patriotic Democrats and patriotic Republicans than has the Committee on Un-American Activities.

It is not a pleasant job for us. It is not a pleasant job for our investigators. But when you read the testimony that they have taken and when you find what is going on, you will realize that it is one of the most necessary committees in the American Congress.

We expect to carry on the fight to save America for Americans, to save our country from destruction at the hands of these Communists, crooks, pinks, punks, stooges, crackpots, and fellow travelers; and I do not care whether they are camouflaged as members of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare or outspoken members of the Communist Party.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting at this point the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on this so-called Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

The matter referred to follows:

#### REPORT ON SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE

(Southern Conference for Human Welfare, formerly 212½ Union Street, Nashville, Tenn., now 808 Perdido Street, New Orleans, La.)

1947-48 officers: Frank P. Graham, honorary president; Clark Howell Foreman, president; James A. Drombrowski, administrator; Frank C. Bancroft and Mrs. Edmonia Grant, assistant administrators.

Vice presidents: Paul R. Christopher, Roscoe Dunjee, Virginia Durr, Lewis W. Jones, William Mitch, Harry W. Schacter.

Board of representatives: E. L. Abercrombie, Mary McLeod Bethune, Charlotte Hawkins Brown, Louis Burnham, Sam Freeman, Helen Fuller, Percy Greene, R. L. Hickman, Myles Horton, J. C. Jacques, Lucy Randolph Mason, Mortimer May, George S.

Mitchell, Frank Prohl, Samuel Rodman, Mrs. A. W. Simkins, Alva W. Taylor, John B. Thompson, Charles Webber.

Ex officio: Henry Fowler,<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Harry M. Gershon, Joseph L. Johnson, Lee C. Sheppard, Aubrey Williams.

Advisory associates: Melvyn Douglas, Mrs. Marshall Field, Kenneth DeP. Hughes, Michael M. Nisselson, Channing H. Tobias, Henry A. Wallace, Palmer Weber.

Tarleton Collier, secretary; J. Daniel Weitzman, treasurer.<sup>2</sup>

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare is an organization which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South. In the early history of the organization, some well-intentioned persons were misled into joining. Many of them have since severed their connections on learning its true character.

Careful examination of its official publication and its activities will disclose that the conference actually is being used in devious ways to further basic Soviet and Communist policy. Decisive and key posts are in most instances controlled by persons whose record is faithful to the line of the Communist Party and the Soviet union.

#### ORIGIN

In reporting to its constituents, the conference is extraordinarily vague as to the exact origin of the organization. "It was born in the hearts and minds of a large group of devoted southerners known as the Southern Policy Committee." No names are given. This nondescript group met several times early in 1933 in Birmingham, Ala. "Several other persons were asked to attend a meeting on July 21, and the idea of a Southern Conference was presented to them." The report does not say who presented the idea or who was present. "The persons present voted themselves in as sponsors and members of the arrangements committee" and subsequently a permanent organization meeting was called at Birmingham on September 6, 1933. (Report of the Proceedings of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, November 22, 23, 1933, pp. 3 and 4.) Its claim to represent any significant proportion of southern opinion is, therefore, entirely self-assumed.

While the conference has succeeded in confusing certain elements in the North by its pretensions, representative southerners harbor no illusions as to its real character. The Democratic Women's Club, of Alabama, an organization of long standing in the South, publicly demanded the disclosure of the names of the initiators of the conference, who provided the necessary finances, and who appointed the delegates. They charged that the conference was of "questionable origin and purpose" (Birmingham News, November 25, 1933).

In their own inner circles the Communists were not nearly so reticent in claiming responsibility for the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. In his article in the Communist of January 1939, official monthly organ of the Communist Party, Robert Fowler Hall, then secretary of the Communist Party, of Alabama, and speaker at the April 1940 session of the conference, reveals the moves behind the scenes. Referring to an earlier speech of Earl Browder, at that time general secretary of the Communist Party, Mr. Hall wrote:

"Comrade Browder's remarks thus anticipated the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, held in Birmingham, November 20-23 \* \* \*. Let us estimate the Southern Conference in the light of Comrade

Browder's remarks at the tenth convention of the Communist Party \* \* \*. In this sense, we can say that the Southern Conference was a brilliant confirmation of the line of the democratic front advanced by Comrade Browder at the tenth convention \* \* \*. Our comrades \* \* \* naturally watched the conference preparations closely and helped wherever possible \* \* \*. Southern State organizations of the Communist Party were represented at the conference by five southern Communist delegates. Our party contributed in a modest but constructive manner to the success of the conference \* \* \*. In strengthening this movement, our party has before it a great task. On this basis, our party can and must proceed to recruit from the progressive ranks many hundreds of members" (pp. 57, 60, 61, and 65).

In other words, the Communists were using the conference as a specific application of the so-called popular-front policy in the South. This line had been adopted by the Communist International at its seventh congress in Moscow in 1935 and was being applied by the Communist parties throughout the world prior to the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact. The honest liberals drawn into the conference were merely the most convenient guinea pigs.

While the Communist Party as such boasted of few delegates, it must be remembered that the bulk of the Communist supporters came from front organizations under their control, which participated in the conference. This was ultimately proven by test votes on various controversial issues.

Communist Party writers made every effort to emphasize the significance of the Conference for Human Welfare. Robert F. Hall, who today is Washington correspondent for the Daily Worker, called it a "representative of the new forces" in the South, working for the "development of a powerful movement of the southern masses for peace, democratic rights, and security" (Communist, August 1940, pp. 690-702). Thus the conference supplemented the activity of the American League for Peace and Democracy, the chief Communist front during this period.

James W. Ford, Negro Communist candidate for Vice President, speaking of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and the Southern Negro Youth Conference, declared, with considerable pride, that "The Communists, through their pioneering work in the South, may justly claim to have laid the foundation for these great social movements" (Communist, September 1933, p. 828).

In a radio address delivered on November 27, 1938, over Station WOL, Earl Browder expressed the opinion that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was one of the signs of the awakening of the American people. In a public hearing before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities he identified it as one of his party's "transmission belts."

Evidence before our committee indicates that the central committee of the Communist Party was intimately concerned with the affairs of the conference from its very inception. William Weiner, former treasurer of the Communist Party, testified that a subsidy of \$2,000 had been paid to the Communist Party of Alabama in 1938, when the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was founded, that this conference had been discussed with Robert F. Hall, when he was in New York, and that it had also been discussed by the central committee of the Communist Party. Mr. Browder publicly admitted that the Communist Party had "suffered great hardships to maintain the growing southern movement."

#### Communist manipulation

Not only do the Communists claim the conference as their own product, but they even disclose how they pulled the strings. Mr. Hall, apparently the chief moving spirit, points out that the main work of the conference was carried out through sections or panels and that resolutions adopted in the panels were usually adopted by the conference as a whole (Communist, January 1939, p. 58). Here is how this plan actually operated.

A resolution on education was presented by Paul Crouch for the Communist Party of Alabama and unanimously adopted (Daily Worker, November 22, 1938, p. 6). Crouch was a member of the editorial staff of the Southern Worker, official organ of the Communist Party in the South. Associated with him on this board were Robert F. Hall and Ted Wellman, Communist Party State secretary for Tennessee. Crouch was convicted for treasonable activities within the armed forces of the United States in Hawaii on June 8, 1925. He subsequently made a pilgrimage to Moscow where he paraded in a Red Army uniform (Daily Worker, May 1, 1928, p. 5).

Members of the resolutions committee of the November 20-23, 1933, conference were: Chairman, Clyde M. Mills, Georgia; Prentiss M. Terry, Alabama; William Mitch, Alabama; George Googe, Georgia; R. R. Moore, Alabama; Lucy Randolph Mason, Virginia; Father Rambouts, Louisiana; Donald Comer, Alabama; Stanton E. Smith, Tennessee; Virginia Henry Mayfield, Alabama; Dr. Arthur Raper, Georgia; Myles Horton, Tennessee; Roy Lawrence, North Carolina; Julia F. Allen, Kentucky; Barry Bingham, Kentucky; Elizabeth Hawes, South Carolina; W. C. Kelley, Florida; Edwin A. Elliott, Texas; F. D. Patterson, Alabama; Leonard Logan, Oklahoma; Mrs. D. D. Terry, Arkansas; George McLean, Mississippi.

There is no record in the proceedings or elsewhere of their opposition to the activities within the conference of such outstanding Communists as Paul Crouch, Robert F. Hall, Ted Wellman, John P. Davis, and Edward E. Strong. The committee adopted the following Communist Party line resolutions: Demand for the release of the Scottsboro boys, endorsement of the Communist-dominated Congress of Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples, and condemnation of the Dies committee.

Joseph Gelders was active in the conference's committee on plans for a permanent organization. Representing the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Gelders was also the secretary of the strategy committee in the campaign for the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill. He was formerly secretary of the National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners, which has been cited as subversive by Attorney General Biddle. Gelders personally accompanied Earl Browder on a visit to the Scottsboro boys (convicted of rape in Alabama) (Daily Worker, September 15, 1936, p. 3). He raised his voice in protest against the arrests of Communists in Chattanooga (Daily Worker, April 6, 1938, p. 3). He was also leader of a lobby for the American Peace Mobilization, which conducted a picket line about the White House and denounced President Roosevelt as a "war monger" (Sunday Worker, September 8, 1940, p. 3).

John P. Davis, identified as a leading member of the Communist Party by testimony before our committee and former secretary of the National Negro Congress, cited as a subversive organization by the Attorney General, was a leading speaker in the panel on constitutional rights of the first conference in 1938, and the 500 delegates applauded his report. He was also vice president of the conference (Daily Worker, November 22, 1938, p. 6; April 17, 1940, p. 4).

<sup>1</sup> See p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> The Southern Patriot, December 1946.



Yelverton Cowherd, signer of a resolution against the Dies committee in 1939, who appeared before the La Follette committee in 1937 to defend the case of Joseph Gelders, was a member of the nominating committee at the first conference, according to its official proceedings.

Edward E. Strong, described by James W. Ford, Communist Vice Presidential candidate, as "a coming leader of the Negro people," present secretary of the National Negro Congress, contributor to the Communist youth magazine, the Champion, and signer of a statement in March 1941 defending the Communist Party, was a prominent speaker in the panel on youth problems in the 1938 conference, together with Howard Lee, attorney for Oscar Wheeler, Communist candidate for Governor of West Virginia. Strong was elected a member of the executive committee of the Council of Young Southerners, described on its letterhead as having "its origin at the Youth Commission of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare." He has been cited as a member of the special branch of the Young Communist League.

Dr. Herman C. Nixon was elected executive secretary of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in 1938. He had been forced out of Tulane University for his social views. He had been cochairman of the Citizens Committee To Investigate Vigilantism in Gadsden, Ala., an offshoot of the International Labor Defense, and a member of the National Committee for People's Rights and the provisional committee of the National Conference on Constitutional Liberties. The International Labor Defense, as well as the last two committees named, have been cited as subversive by the Attorney General. Nixon's book, *Forty Acres and Steel Mules*, has been highly praised by Robert F. Hall, then Communist secretary for Alabama, in the New South of February 1939 (p. 10).

Two known Communist Party members who have supported the conference in recent years are Don West, poet and professor; Langston Hughes, writer. Paul Robeson, who has frequently defended the Communist Party and attended its meetings, voiced an appeal for the release of Earl Browder at the conference's meeting in 1942. His appeal was echoed by Frank P. Graham in a statement sent to the President.

#### James Dombrowski

At the April 1942 sessions of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, James Dombrowski was elected executive secretary. He was the signer of a statement defending the Communist Party in March 1941 and a speaker for the National Conference for Constitutional Liberties in 1940. The latter organization has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

Dombrowski, together with Myles Horton, a member of the present board of representatives of the conference, helped launch a joint Socialist-Communist united-front movement in the South in 1935. As Socialist Party leaders in Tennessee, the two men endorsed a united-front plan of action which included campaigns against the AAA and for a "rank-and-file" movement in the American Federation of Labor (Chattanooga Times, January 28, 1935, p. 5). They have both been charged with operating as stooges for the Communist Party within Socialist circles.

A clue to Dombrowski's political views is given in his book, *The Early Days of Christian Socialism in America* (1936). Dombrowski asserts that the Reverend George D. Herron, whom he considers "by far the most able man" in the early days of the Christian Socialist movement, pointed out in the last decade of the nineteenth century, "That class lines were becoming more sharply defined, that the logic of the inherent contradictions within capitalism was leading inevitably to

more and more concentration of wealth, to the enrichment of the few at the expense of the masses" (p. 30).

Dombrowski goes on to defend Herron's views on violence. Herron, he says, "did not think that violence was inimical to a religious approach to social change. Peace at the expense of justice was not a religious solution to social problems. And resorting to his social interpretation of the cross, according to which all moral progress is made at the expense of suffering and sacrifice, he looked upon a revolution by violence, provided it promised a more just society, as a possible technique for social change worthy of the sanction of religion" (p. 193).

"In his acceptance of the fact of the class struggle went the implicit recognition of the necessity for coercion" (p. 192).

Frank P. Graham, head of the University of North Carolina, was the first chairman of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and today remains as its honorary president. He is not a Communist and no doubt on occasion has had some differences with the Communist Party. He is, however, one of those liberals who show a predilection for affiliation to various Communist-inspired front organizations.

Graham urged freedom for Earl Browder and served as sponsor for a dinner which the publication, *Soviet Russia Today*, held to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Red Army. He also was associated with the International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party; American League for Peace and Democracy; American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; American Friends of Spanish Democracy; China Aid Council; China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy; Committee for Boycott Against Japanese Aggression; Conference to Lift the Embargo; Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo; Medical Bureau; and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

#### Other officers

The roster of conference officers for 1947-48 shows that pro-Communists and fellow travelers still hold the reins of the organization. James Dombrowski continues to occupy his same key position under the new title of administrator. Serving as his associate and also as editor of the conference organ, the Southern Patriot, is Frank C. Bancroft, who has a lengthy record of Communist Party front activity.

Bancroft defended the Communist Party on March 5, 1941, and April 26, 1947, and also defended Sam Darcy, a Communist Party candidate for Governor of California, who was convicted of perjury. Bancroft signed an open letter calling for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union and held the responsible post of managing editor with *Social Work Today*, a publication which promulgated Communist propaganda among social workers.

His other Communist front associations include the American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House during the Stalin-Hitler Pact; the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which defended Communist cases; the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, which defended Communist teachers; People's Institute of Applied Religion, headed by Claude C. Williams, a Communist Party member; and the Social Workers Committee for Russian War Relief.

Rounding out the administrative staff of the conference is Mrs. Edmonia Grant, also an associate to Dombrowski. A member of the conference since its inception, she defended the Communist Party on April 26, 1947, and supported the front organization, National Negro Congress.

#### Clark Howell Foreman

Clark Howell Foreman, president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, has no open affiliation with the Communist Party. He has frequently denied any such affiliations or connections. He has been most successful in confusing the people as to the Communist-front character of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

Foreman has written a book entitled "The New Internationalism" in which his understanding of the international Communist movement and his sympathies with it are reflected on almost every page. The book displays marked contempt for European democratic Socialists and reformists, who are equivalent in this country to liberals who prefer democratic rather than revolutionary methods. Foreman does not hesitate, however, to exploit and deceive such liberals to the limit in the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. And although he ventures certain mild criticisms of Soviet policy, he has not recently expressed any such strictures toward either the Soviet Government or the American Communists.

We cite certain passages from Foreman's book to illustrate his views:

"Karl Marx arose as the great philosopher for the laboring man" (p. 26).

"Lenin correctly described the Russian bourgeoisie as the weakest link in the capitalist chain" (p. 44).

After showing the break-down of capitalist internationalism, Foreman quotes G. M. Stekloff, well-known Russian Communist writer, as follows:

"But whereas the internationalism of the bourgeoisie is continually frustrated by the mutual competition of national capitalism, the internationalism of the proletariat is nourished and strengthened by the active solidarity of the interests of all the workers, regardless of their dwelling place or nationality" (p. 74).

"\* \* \* The Paris Commune stands next to the Russian revolution as an achievement of the Socialist theory" (p. 77).

Criticizing the reformist Socialist leaders, Foreman quotes J. Lenz, a leading Communist writer:

"The overwhelming majority of the party and trade-union leaders drew from the experiences of the Russian revolution the opposite conclusion—that of retreat from decisive conflicts with the class enemy, of avoiding struggles which demanded sacrifice as the struggles in Russia had done, of adaptation to the bourgeois order of society, of limiting the movement to parliamentary methods of struggle" (p. 79).

"In an appeal to the Socialists of all countries, the Petrograd Soviet said: 'This war is a monstrous crime on the part of the imperialists of all countries who, by their lust for annexations, by their mad race for armaments, have prepared and made inevitable the world conflagration'" (p. 83).

"The militant leaders of the Marxian bolsheviks, under the cry of 'Peace, Bread, and Land,' appealed to the popular desires of the masses" (p. 84).

"To all the colonial and semicolonial peoples, however, Russia's successful break from the capitalist system was a great inspiration" (p. 88).

"\* \* \* the more powerful Stalin had banished Trotsky and his friends and had eloquently announced to the world his 5-year plan of industrialization" (p. 90).

"Internally, the Russians, despite their liberality to the minorities in the U. S. S. R., were almost inevitably bound to consider their success in nationalist terms" (p. 90).

"With such a set-up it is patent that the U. S. S. R. is potentially capable of being both self-sufficient in case of war and prosperous in times of peace" (p. 139).

Foreman is associated with the Progressive Citizens of America, an allegedly liberal organization which believes in cooperating with Communists. He has also been affiliated with the following Communist-front groups: The Win-the-Peace Conference; the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which defended Communist cases before the United States Civil Service Commission; and the National Citizens Political Action Committee.

#### FOREIGN POLICY

The most conclusive proof of the Communist domination of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is to be found in the organization's strict and unvarying conformance to the line of the Communist Party in the field of foreign policy. It is also a clear indication of the fact that the real purpose of the organization was not human welfare in the South but rather to serve as a convenient vehicle in support of the current Communist Party line.

In 1938, when the Communist Party was advocating collective security of the democracies against the Fascist aggressors, a letter of greeting from President Roosevelt brought 2,000 conference delegates to their feet cheering (Daily Worker, November 22, 1938, p. 1). The conference voted to endorse "an American peace policy, such as proposed by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull, to promote the national security of our country, to curb aggression, and assist the democratic peoples of the world to preserve peace, liberty, and freedom."

The change of the Communist line resulting from the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact invoked a bitter struggle in the Southern Conference for Human Welfare at its meeting in April 1940. Robert F. Hall, secretary of the Communist Party of Alabama, acting as the Communist whip, presented an eight-point program which demanded "an uncompromising peace policy." The liberals led by Frank P. Graham and W. R. Couch, of the University of North Carolina, supported the policy of the Roosevelt administration. At one stage in the battle there was a threat of fistfights. But the liberals were no match for the Communist steam roller, which castigated them with the high crime of being anti-Soviet. The thousand delegates denounced war and pro-Allied propaganda, as threatening America with war. They declared themselves "unalterably opposed to loans to the Allies and other belligerents" and denounced war appropriations "at the expense of the welfare of the American people at home." The only consolation which the liberals salvaged from the fracas was a mild resolution condemning aggression by "Nazis, Communists, or imperialists." The Communists could grant their opponents this convenient sop since in their eyes the Soviet invasion of Finland and Poland was not aggression but liberation (Daily Worker, April 17, 1940, p. 4).

The rift between the Communists and the liberals was quickly healed as soon as Hitler invaded the Soviet fatherland and the Communists suddenly relinquished their "unalterable" opposition to the war. Wholehearted agreement marked the sessions of the conference held on April 19, 20, and 21, 1942, devoted to "the South's part in winning the war for democracy." The convention demanded that all "join in a great offensive now, to work, to produce, to sacrifice, to win." (Daily Worker, April 23, 1942, p. 3.)

With the end of World War II, the attitude of the conference on foreign policy veered once more in line with the new policy of the Communist Party. A resolution supported by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and several other organizations, in April 1947, declared: "Monopoly corporations' profits are draining dry the Nation's purchasing power; and this lust for profits is

not only threatening our Nation with early economic disaster but is leading, behind the smoke screen of the false issue of communism, to imperialist adventures and more profit hunting abroad, and may yet pile a war on our heads as well as an economic depression." (Daily Worker, May 6, 1947, p. 5.)

Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party in America, voiced exactly the same idea in his pamphlet, *What America Faces*, March 1946 (p. 14): "We are witnessing how the monopolists and their reactionary congressional coalition, aided by the administration, are reconverting. Theirs is a reconversion . . . as they hope, to union busting and the open shop, to soaring profits and prices and sinking wages and living standards, to aggression upon the democratic rights of the people here and upon the democracies abroad; theirs is a reconversion which, if they are permitted to pursue their course, is the road to the Hoover years of the great crisis, and to a new world war as the 'way out' of capitalist crisis."

The new Communist Party doctrine is critical of any American "interference" in foreign politics but entirely favorable toward Russian expansionism. The conference organ, the Southern Patriot, clings closely to this line in its April 1946 issue. It quotes a leading conference spokesman as saying: "It was easy to gang up on the Russians . . . while the Czars were fighting the people of the country with their perfidious policies and police. It was easy to gang up on the Russians during the days of the Russian revolution. It has been easy for the rest of us to gang up ever since. I do not want to be a party to such a process" (p. 3).

" . . . It comes with ill grace for certain world powers whose troops are stationed in every nation from Egypt to Singapore to make a world conflagration out of the movement of a few troops a few miles into a neighboring territory to resist an oil monopoly which they enjoy. And if American foreign policy is made the scapegoat for such imperialism it is more stupid than I thought it possible for it to be . . ." (p. 5).

" . . . Before us then is the choice, war or peace, poverty or plenty, hopelessness or hope. If this decision were left to a free choice of the people of America, to the people of the Big Three, to the Russians whose faces were wreathed in smiles and friendship when one said, 'Amerikanski' to them, I know what the decision would be" (p. 5).

The Southern Patriot editors suggested that readers could get full copies of this "strong and brilliant" appeal from the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship—and went on to recommend the council's biweekly propaganda sheet, *Reported on American Soviet Relations*, as presenting "many facts not often available in the daily press."

President Truman's foreign policy in Greece and Turkey came in for abuse at the annual meeting of the conference's Washington committee in Washington, D. C., on April 7, 1947.

J. Raymond Walsh, a "frank apologist for the Communist line," according to Prof. John H. Childs, of Columbia University, speaking for the Southern Conference in Washington, flayed President Truman's foreign policy in Greece and Turkey.

Insisting that America is a "radical nation," Walsh called upon the members to "defy fear and defy the forces who made the empty tables here tonight." "Some were afraid to come," he admitted.

Entertainer at the Washington meeting was Susan Reed, employed by Cafe Society, a night club owned by Barney Josephson, brother of Leon Josephson, leading Commu-

nist, Soviet Secret Service operative, charged with passport frauds. Mrs. Leon Josephson also owns an interest in this enterprise. Barney Josephson has been a supporter of the New York branch of the Southern Conference.

Conference President Clark Foreman, as toastmaster at the Washington meeting, denied that "anyone is afraid of communism."

The Washington committee of the conference obtained Henry Wallace, foremost critic of President Truman's foreign policy, for a public speech in the Nation's Capital, June 16, 1947. The committee scheduled on the same program Zero Mostel, a favorite entertainer at Communist affairs and member of the American Youth for Democracy, formerly the Young Communist League.

The Washington committee's executive secretary is Robert Ware Straus, Information Director for the Office of Emergency Management, who tried to get an OEM job for Ruth McKenney, well-known writer for the Communist publications, the Daily Worker and New Masses. Sponsors of the Washington group include Morris and Samuel Rodman, brothers, associated with the pro-Communist Metropolitan Broadcasting Co.; and Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, a delegate to the Communist-controlled Women's International Democratic Federation in Paris in 1945.

At the South-wide fourth biennial convention of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, held in New Orleans, November 28-30, 1946, the chief speaker devoted most of his talk to a defense of Russia as a "misunderstood" Government which will continue to remain at peace with the United States (Washington Daily News, November 29, 1946, p. 3, and New York Daily Worker, November 30, 1946, p. 4).

In January of that year the Southern Patriot listed a Senator who calls for a strong Germany as one of the "Representatives of the South in Congress, whose abandonment of the program the people voted for in 1944 should be remembered by their constituents when they come up for reelection" (p. 7). This position is in line with the discredited Morgenthau plan which has received enthusiastic Communist support.

The stand of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare on various other issues in which the Communist Party has been primarily concerned serves to clinch the charge that the organization is merely a pliable instrument in the hands of pro-Communist wire pullers behind the scenes.

Public record fails to reveal that the conference has ever officially denounced communism or opposed Soviet policies.

The chairman of the committee for Virginia, Mr. Henry H. Fowler, after seeing the preliminary press announcement of the committee's report, requested the committee to include by any mention of his name in the report, a notation that he had resigned from all affiliations with the southern conference as of April 15, 1947, after a membership of 1 year. His letter of resignation was duly acknowledged on April 28, 1947, by James A. Dombrowski, administrator. The reason he assigned for his resignation was stated in his letter as follows:

"The decisive factor in my present decision is the absence in the southern conference of any clear and positive stand against communism and the inclusion of Communists in the working organization and the unwillingness of my own State committee to initiate steps which would require a facing of this issue."

Elsewhere in his letter of resignation it appears that the State committee had rejected a resolution proposed by Mr. Fowler which expressed opposition to totalitarianism, be it Fascist or Communist, and would require each applicant for membership to assert by written pledge that he or she was "not a member of the Communist Party, or the Ku Klux Klan, or any other group or



organization which to his knowledge, is opposed to the purposes and ideals of the organization as stated in this pledge."

#### JOINT ACTIVITY WITH COMMUNIST FRONTS

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare has further revealed itself as a Communist front organization by its cooperation with other Communist-dominated front groups.

Among these groups following the lead of the Communist Party in support of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare are the University of Virginia Chapter of the American Student Union (Student Almanac, p. 44), International Labor Defense (Yearbook 1939-41, p. 25), New South (October 1938, p. 15), Workers Alliance (Daily Worker, November 21, 1938, p. 1), Labor Research Association (pamphlet, Southern Labor in Wartime, p. 22), and the American Federation of Teachers at that time under Communist control (American Teacher, December 1938, p. 7).

In recent years, cooperation has also come from these Communist-controlled organizations: National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (April 4, 1946); United Office and Professional Workers of America, CIO (April 4, 1946); International Workers Order (February 1, 1947); League of Women Shoppers (September 8, 1946); United Public Workers of America, CIO (February 1, 1947); United Negro and Allied Veterans (September 8, 1946).

Samuel Neuburger, attorney for the Communist Party and for Leon Josephson, Soviet Secret Service operative charged with passport frauds, was one of the chief speakers at a mass meeting sponsored in Washington, D. C., April 4, 1946, by the local organizations of the Southern Conference, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, and United Office and Professional Workers of America.

The president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare (Clark H. Foreman) was a member of the initiating committee of the Congress on Civil Rights, which met in Detroit, April 27-28, 1946, and which is now defending Gerhart Eisler, Comintern agent.

When the New York committee of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare held a 3-day street collection called Lend a Hand to Dixie Land, September 19-21, 1946, the Communist-controlled American Labor Party of New York announced that its Bronx County clubs would hold street rallies in support of the drive. (Daily Worker, September 21, 1946, p. 5.)

The Daily Worker of May 27, 1947, publicized with approval the stand taken on southern issues by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, the New Jersey State secretariat of the Communist Party, Civil Rights Congress, and the Progressive Citi-

zens of America. Activities of the Southern Conference are generally featured prominently in the Daily Worker.

It is also interesting that funds totaling \$1,500 were received by the conference in 1942 from the Robert Marshall Foundation—an organization which has donated heavily to the support of Communist-front groups.

The Southern Patriot gives publicity to activities of such other front organizations as the Southern Negro Youth Congress and the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax.

In June 1947 the conference organ also urged readers to demand local radio-station outlets for a new weekly union radio broadcast, sponsored by the Communist-controlled United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO (p. 7).

Other publications recommended to Southern Patriot readers significantly include Facts and Fascism, by George Seides, who edits the pro-Communist gossip and scandal sheet known as In Fact. Seides' views have received high commendation from the Soviet press.

The Southern Patriot editor also has offered as reading suggestions: We Have Seen America, a collection of addresses by three Soviet journalists who toured America and bitterly criticized it, appropriately published by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship; The Races of Mankind, a eulogy of Russia's treatment of minority groups that was condemned by the War Department; All Brave Sailors, a eulogy of the leftist National Maritime Union, written by John Beecher; and How Is Your Health? published by the Physicians Forum, a Communist front.

The conference publication in addition has defended the book, Our Good Neighbors in Soviet Russia, which was taken off the Texas school textbook list because of its pro-Soviet bias. The Southern Patriot has printed quotations from War Department orientation fact sheet No. 64—a fact sheet so suited to the Communist cause that the International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party, had it reprinted. The War Department subsequently withdrew this pamphlet from circulation.

#### NEGROES

In allying themselves with the Communists and in permitting the Communists to control policy and strategic positions, the non-Communists in the Southern Conference for Human Welfare are wittingly or unwittingly promoting the following fundamental principles of the Communist Party in dealing with the Negro question:

1. The Communists are not interested in the long-range welfare of the Negro. They are interested rather in using the issue as explosive and revolutionary tinder in destroying American democracy.

2. They have placed themselves on record as favoring an independent Negro Soviet Republic in the southern Black Belt which in essence is a call to civil war in which the Negro population would be the unhappy victims and in which all their social gains made in recent years would be sacrificed.

#### DENOUNCED BY SOUTHERNERS

The pro-Communist bias of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare has been publicly attacked on several occasions. This committee formally cited the organization as a Communist front on March 29, 1944.

CIO leaders in April 1946 renounced the aid of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in the union's southern organizational campaign, declaring: "No crowd, whether Communist, Socialist, or anybody else, is going to mix up in this organizing drive" (Baltimore Sun, April 19, 1946, p. 17).

The Daily Worker quickly sprang to the defense of the conference and denounced the CIO for a "red baiting" attack (Daily Worker, April 20, 1946, p. 5).

The Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans adopted the following resolution on November 14, 1946:

"Be it resolved, That the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans go on record as being opposed to the activities of the organization known as the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, that the press and city officials be notified that many of the national officers of this group have definite communistic tendencies."

#### INTERLOCKING WITH COMMUNIST CAUSES

One could reasonably conceive of a group of individuals motivated by a desire to form an organization to promote human welfare in the South and with no trace of Communist sympathy or affiliation. One could even conceive of a group of well-intentioned but non-Communist individuals being enticed by camouflaged Communists into an enterprise strictly limited to this humanitarian cause. In the light of the fact that a significant number of the leading lights of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare are associated with organizations or campaigns for the defense of the Communist Party or individual Communists, or with organizations defending the Soviet Union, or its policies—issues which have nothing to do with the South—one is forced to the conclusion that, by and large the common bond among its supporters is a certain degree of sympathy for the Soviet Union and/or the Communist Party, rather than any primary interest in human welfare in the South. One is further forced to conclude that the professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States.

Southern Conference for Human Welfare (name and position)	Statement defending Communist Party	Support or defense of individual Communists	Organizations defending Communists	Pro-Soviet relief or propaganda organizations	Organizations defending Soviet foreign policy
Ameringer, Oscar, sponsor			NFCL		ALWF, APM, CDAKOW.
Bancroft, Frank C., editor	Mar. 5, 1941	Darcy	ACDIF, NFCL	RWR	APM.
Bethune, Mary McLeod, member, board of representatives		F. Smith, Herndon	ACPF, NFCL	NCASF	ALPD.
Blanchard, Myles D., speaker			NFCL		ALPD
Brown, Charlotte Hawkins, member, board of representatives	Apr. 26, 1947	Mar. 18, 1945, Schappes	NFCL		WFC.
Buckmaster, Henrietta, member, New York, executive board		Dimitrov, Schappes	JARC, WCDA	NCASF	
Burnham, Louis, member, board of representatives		Browder	NFCL, ILD		APM.
Clement, Rufus E., member, executive board		Bloor	ACDIF, ACPFB	ACSR	
Coffey, John M., sponsor			NFCL, NYCIR, ILD, JARC, WCDA, WTM.	NCASF	ALPD.
Davies, Joseph E., sponsor		Herndon	JARC	NCASF	ALPD, APM.
Davis, John P., sponsor, vice president			NFCL, NYCIR, IJA, ILD, JCDBP, CRF, NLG, WCDA	NCASF	APM.
De Lacy, Hugh, sponsor		Browder, Bridges, Schappes	NFCL, ACPFB, ILD, ACDIF		APM, CDAKOW.
DeLaney, Hubert T., sponsor		F. Smith, Herndon	NFCL		
Dinwiddie, Courtenay, sponsor		Browder	NFCL		
Dobbs, Malcolm Cotton, Alabama executive secretary			NFCL		
Dombrowski, James, executive secretary, administrator	Mar. 5, 1941		NFCL		
Douglas, Melvyn, advisory associate					
Dunjee, Roscoe, vice president	Apr. 26, 1947	Schappes, Herndon			ALPD.

Southern Conference for Human Welfare (name and position)	Statement defending Communist Party	Support or defense of individual Communists	Organizations defending Communists	Pro-Soviet relief or propaganda organizations	Organizations defending Soviet foreign policy
Durr, Virginia Foster, vice president			NCPR		
Emerson, Thomas I., sponsor			NLG, IJA		
Ezekiel, Lucille, supporter			WCDA, WTMC		
Feinberg, William, member New York executive board		Dimitrov	JARC	RWR	
Foreman, Clark H., president			WCDA		WPC.
Frazier, E. Franklin, sponsor		Browder	WCDA		APM.
Gelders, Joseph	Apr. 6, 1938	Browder	NCDPP, ILD, NFCL	NCASF	ALPD.
Graham, Frank P., honorary president			ACDIF, ACPFB, ILD		
Grant, Edmonia, associate administrator	Apr. 26, 1947				
Granger, Lester, sponsor		Prestes	ILD		
Hall, Robert F., congress delegate, 1940			JARC	ASCRR, NCASF	
Harriman, Mrs. J. Borden, supporter			NFCL	ACASF	APM, CDAKOW.
Harris, Gerald, member, executive board					
Hastie, William H., sponsor			NFCL, ILD, WCDA		
Hawes, Elizabeth, sponsor		Bloor, Flynn	NECDR	ACSR, NCASF	
Houston, Charles H., sponsor	Mar. 5, 1941	Schappes, Herndon	ACPF, WCDA, NFCL	NCASF	
Ickes, Harold L., speaker	Apr. 26, 1947	Browder, Foster, Schappes	NCDPP, NFCL	FSU, NCASF	ALWF, APM.
Jernagin, William H., sponsor				NCASF	ASC.
Jones, David D., sponsor	Apr. 26, 1947	Schappes	NFCL, WCDA, WTMC		ALPD.
Joseph, Robert, sponsor		Browder	NFCL		
Kirchwey, Freda, sponsor		Schappes, Stamm, Bloor	ACDIF, NFCL	ARI	AAAIL.
Lee, Canada, sponsor		Schappes, F. Smith	ACDIF, LDC, NFCL	RWR	APM.
Lindeman, Eduard C., member, New York executive board		Browder	ACPF, ILD, SLDC	ACSR	ALPD.
Mays, Benjamin, member, nominating committee, 1947-48	Mar. 18, 1945	Bridges	JARC, NYCIR		
McAvoy, Clifford, supporter	Apr. 27, 1947	Bridges, Browder, Darcy, Schappes		NCASF	
	Mar. 5, 1941		ACDIF, NFCL, ACPFB, ILD	ACSR, NCASF	ALPD, CDAKOW.
McMichael, Jack, member, New York executive board	do				ALPD, APM, CDAKOW.
Mollegan, Albert T., sponsor	Apr. 29, 1947		NFCL		WPC.
Nixon, Herman C., executive secretary	Mar. 19, 1940	Browder	NFCL, WTMC		ALPD.
Parker, Dorothy, member, New York executive board			NFCL, ILD, NCPR		
Peters, E. C., sponsor			ACPF, NYTMC, HLDA, JARC, CRC	ACSR	ALPD.
Pressman, Lee, sponsor			ILD	ACSR, NCASF	
Reid, Ira DeA., speaker	Apr. 26, 1947	Browder	IJA, NFCL, WCDA, NLG		ALWF.
	July 23, 1940		ACPF, NFCL		
Robeson, Paul, member, New York executive board	Sept. 23, 1940	Bridges, Browder, Schappes, F. Smith	ACDIF, NFCL, ACPFB, JARC	RWR, NCASF	APM, WPC.
	Mar. 5, 1941				
	Apr. 26, 1947				
Smith, Lillian, sponsor		Browder			APM.
Smith, Mason, speaker		Browder, Schappes			APM, CDAKOW.
Spottswood, Stephen G., sponsor	Apr. 26, 1947				
Strong, Edward E., sponsor	Mar. 5, 1941			ACSR	ALPD, APM, CDAKOW.
Taylor, Alvah W., member, board of representatives	Mar. 18, 1945	Schappes, Bridges			
Thompson, John B., member, board of representatives			ACPF		APM, CDAKOW.
Tobias, Channing, advisory associate		Dimitrov	NFCL	NCASF	ALPD, WPC.
Wallace, Henry A., advisory associate	May 29, 1947		ACPF, ACDIF	ARI	
Walsh, J. Raymond, speaker	Dec. 14, 1939		ACPF, NFCL	ACSR	
Webber, Charles C., member, nominating committee, 1947-48		Bridges	ACSR, JARC, NFCL		ALWF.

<sup>1</sup> Member, national committee, Communist Party, USA.

#### TABLE OF SYMBOLS

AAAIL	All American Anti-Imperialist League.
ACDIF	American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.
ACPF	American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.
ACSR	American Committee for Soviet Relations.
ALPD	American League for Peace and Democracy.
ALWF	American League Against War and Fascism.
APM	American Peace Mobilization.
ARI	American Russian Institute.
ASC	American Slav Congress.
ASCRR	American Society for Cultural Relations with Russia.
CDAKOW	Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War.
CRC	Civil Rights Congress.
CRF	Civil Rights Federation.
FSU	Friends of the Soviet Union.
HLDA	Hollywood League for Democratic Action.
IJA	International Juridical Association.

ILD	International Labor Defense.
JARC	Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.
JCDBP	Joint Committee for the Defense of Brazilian People (Prestes).
LDC	Labor Defense Council.
NCASF	National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.
NCDPP	National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners.
NCPR	National Committee for People's Rights.
NECDR	National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights.
NLG	National Lawyers' Guild.
NYCIR	New York Conference for Inalienable Rights.
NYTMC	New York Tom Mooney Committee.
RWR	Russian War Relief.
SLDC	Sleepy Lagoon Defense Committee.
WCDA	Washington Committee for Democratic Action.
WPC	Win-the-Peace Conference.
WTMC	Washington Tom Mooney Committee.

#### CONCLUSION

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare is perhaps the most deviously camouflaged Communist-front organization. When put to the following acid test it reveals its true character:

1. It shows unswerving loyalty to the basic principles of Soviet foreign policy.
2. It has consistently refused to take sharp issue with the activities and policies of either the Communist Party, USA, or the Soviet Union.
3. It has maintained in decisive posts persons who have the confidence of the Communist press.
4. It has displayed consistent anti-American bias and pro-Soviet bias, despite professions, in generalities, of love for America.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 146, noes 7.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast by George E. Reedy.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one instance with reference to a bill which she is introducing today on migratory farm labor.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, so that no one will have to wonder and no one will have to make a report, I take this opportunity of informing the House that



I am going to avail myself of the opportunity tonight of going to hear our former Secretary of Agriculture, our former Vice President, our former Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Henry A. Wallace, a distinguished American, when he addresses the Southern Conference at Washington, D. C.

The American way is to listen, to read, to try to think for yourself, and then come to some conclusion. God help America if freedom of speech or freedom of assembly is ever seriously threatened.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

#### COMMUNIST PARTY LINE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, here is a remarkable illustration that the Communist Party line is working in perfect coordination to accomplish the veto of the Taft-Hartley bill. It will be interesting to see what effect the party line will have on President Truman when he finally decides what to do with the bill on Friday of this week.

I have here a copy of a radio speech made in New York City by William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party in the United States, over the Nation-wide Mutual radio network on June 10 at 10:15 to 10:30 p. m. Among other things he said, and I quote:

The workers don't want merely a formal veto, the workers . . . demand that President Truman besides vetoing the Taft-Hartley bill should also, as Democratic Party leader, mobilize the Democrats in Congress to sustain his veto.

I also have a copy of the Labor Herald, official California CIO newspaper dated June 10, the same date as the broadcast in New York City and, of course, published before 10 p. m. on that date, which states, and I quote:

The Los Angeles CIO Council warned President Truman this week that a formal veto of the Taft-Hartley bill will not satisfy labor, as head of the Democratic Party we urge you to use the full force of party leadership to bring the Taft-Hartley bill to sure and final defeat.

The striking similarity of the two statements, one uttered over the radio by William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in New York City, the other published in the CIO newspaper in California 3,000 miles away and on the same day, shows that the Communist Party line is working in perfect cooperation to defeat the Taft-Hartley labor bill.

I wonder if the President of the United States will yield to this kind of demand and warning pressure. I wonder if he will have as much courage as Ramadier, Premier of France, who successfully resisted such pressure when he told the Communists to go to. Or I wonder if the Communist Party have a pipe line into the White House.

I hope not. We do not intend to paint the White House red in order to accommodate Mr. Foster and others. I hope I am right in my belief that President

Truman will not yield to the demands and threats of the Communist Party. I cannot believe he will after his recent urgent demand for \$400,000,000 to stop the advance of communism in Greece.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include some radio comment by Mr. George E. Reedy.

#### TODAY WAS TO BE DEBT-FREE DAY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record briefly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today, June 16, 1947, was to have been the day when the United States would be out of debt. That was the program adopted by the Congress back in 1922, believe it or not. We are reminded of the fact by the following words which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald of yesterday:

#### TODAY IS DEBT-FREE DAY

The time is the period just after World War I. Congress was wrestling with the problems arising from the cost of the Nation's biggest war. About ten billions was owed to holders of Government bonds and about nine and one-half billions had been loaned to other nations.

To put the retirement of this debt on a businesslike basis, Congress came up with the Sinking Fund Act of March 3, 1919, and the War Foreign Debt Funding Act of 1922. The domestic and foreign debts were divided into two categories, and orderly provision was made for their retirement.

That's what Congress did, back in the pre-European default, predepression and pre-World War II days of the early twenties. By 1945 the entire domestic debt was to be paid off. By 1947 the foreign debt was to be wiped off the books. Then United States dollars, to coin a phrase, were to be sound as a dollar.

That happy day was to have been reached on June 15, 1947. And June 15, 1947, finds the United States debt around \$260,000,000,000.

Howdy, taxpayers.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a commencement address by Hon. KARL STEFAN delivered on June 6 before the law class of National University Law School.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances.

#### THE WHISKER'S CLUB

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district has been acclaimed far and wide for its outstanding accomplishments and I want to call the attention of the House today to another achievement for which we are gaining added fame.

I am referring to the Waynesboro Beards, better known as the Whisker's Club. In anticipation of Waynesboro's one hundred and fiftieth anniversary, July 6-11, 1947, the Sesqui Whisker's Club was organized last February. Since then hundreds of men have joined the rolls. The beards will not be shaved off until after the sesquicentennial celebration. Waynesboro's beards will be the official and genuine old-time dress of local men for the celebration.

As a preliminary to the sesquicentennial anniversary 200 members of the Whisker's Club and a band will be in Washington on Sunday, June 22 next, at 11 o'clock on the Capitol steps, and I am authorized to extend this invitation to the membership of the House to come out and meet these men.

Members of the Whisker's Club are coming to Washington 200 strong in six chartered busses, headed by Waynesboro's burgess, Harry C. Funk, who has good naturedly been raising a beard since February, and Edward V. Kotserba, publicity manager of the beards. They will pose on the Capitol steps for newspapers and newsreel cameramen before they embark for Griffith Stadium where they will attend the double-header between the Washington Senators and the St. Louis Browns.

During sesquicentennial week you are all invited to come to Waynesboro where a daily pageant will be held each evening in Fairview Avenue Stadium. There will be firemen's contests, float parades, band contests, shirt-tail and bearded-men's parades. Prizes amounting to \$6,000 will be awarded.

Tom Breneman, who hails from Waynesboro, will be on hand to present his radio show Breakfast in Hollywood daily at 11 o'clock from Fairview Stadium.

We expect upward of 100,000 people to attend the Waynesboro celebration. Governor Duff, of Pennsylvania, Senator EDWARD MARTIN, and our own Speaker JOE MARTIN have been officially invited by the sesquicentennial committee.

Now do not forget, it is next Sunday, June 22, at 11 o'clock, on the Capitol steps. Come out and join us. If you look for me I will be there, probably behind an ersatz beard.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made previously today and include the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a statement prepared by Joseph Leib, relative to the recent air crashes.

#### FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the motion to table that was presented a few minutes ago and voted for the motion to strike, but I want you to know that I can see some danger creeping into this thing.

I thought the telegram went too far, especially the last part that was called to our attention by our distinguished Speaker. I thought that was highly improper, but I am not sure about all of the telegram being of unparliamentary language. Certainly we must recognize the fact that we are not perfect and all we do is not sacrosanct; that people do have a right to criticize us the same as we have a right to criticize others; and we must be careful, Mr. Speaker, that we do not trespass upon the right of freedom of speech in this great country of ours.

I definitely expect to always be found, to the full strength of my soul, fighting to maintain freedom of speech.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM R. GREEN

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

THE SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain that request but without objection will recognize the gentleman for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty of announcing to the Members of Congress the passing of a former Member of this body, the Honorable William R. Green. At the time of Mr. Green's resignation from Congress he was chairman of the important Ways and Means Committee of this House. Some who sit on this floor today remember well the valuable, patriotic, unselfish service which Mr. Green rendered to this country. I listened with a heavy heart to the last words spoken at the grave this morning when this great American was laid to rest in a beautiful silent valley in Rock Creek Cemetery here in the District of Columbia.

We who know him best recognized him as one of the most outstanding public servants and loyal Americans who ever graced the floor of this House.

Mr. Green was a resident of my home county, Audubon, when I was a boy, and I can truly state that he has always been an inspiration to me. I have the honor of representing in this Congress the same district which this great patriot represented so ably for 17 years. The editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil had this to say about Hon. William R. Green:

A FAITHFUL PUBLIC SERVANT

William R. Green, who served as district judge from 1894 to 1911, Member of Congress from this district for 17 years, and member of the Federal court of claims for 12 years, died the other day at the age of 90.

Judge Green was well known to many of the older residents of Council Bluffs and Southwest Iowa. As a district judge he held court in many counties. As a Member of Congress he became chairman of the Ways and Means Committee which drafts the tax laws. He helped determine the taxes which paid for the First World War. After it was over he helped work out the reductions which brought about relief to the taxpayers but brought in sufficient revenue to reduce the national debt at a rapid rate.

He retired from Congress to become judge of the Court of Claims which was busy dealing with suits brought against the Government resulting from the war.

The last time we saw Judge Green, we believe it was in 1939, the court had comparatively little to do. He retired in 1940 and made his home with his daughter in New York.

Judge Green was a gentleman of the old school, who served his country in many capacities, always with distinction, and to the satisfaction of the public.

Southwest Iowa has reason to be proud of his long and distinguished record.

I know I have expressed the feeling in the hearts of those who knew the Honorable William Green. We extend our heartfelt sympathies to his bereaved family. God rest his soul.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. One of the first men I met when I came to Congress was William R. Green. He and his elegant wife and daughter lived in the same hotel that we did. I served with him from that time until he resigned to take a place on the bench. I certainly join in everything the gentleman from Iowa has said about him. He was one of the finest characters I have ever known. He was a great American, an able Representative of the great State of Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It was not my good fortune to be personally acquainted with Hon. William R. Green, although I feel I know him because of the praise of his service which I have heard from the lips of so many folks back home long before I came to Congress.

Since coming to Congress many Members of this House of Representatives who served with Mr. Green have told me of his great ability, statesmanship, and high purpose. I join with my colleague from Iowa in what he has said. Iowa and America have lost a great citizen.

LYNCHING BEING LYNCHED

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial entitled "Good Mayor," in the Washington Post last Saturday, is worthy not only of the perusal of every Member of the Congress, but also it challenges the best thoughtful pondering of every citizen.

It is important enough to enjoin the prayerful attention of everyone who has ears to hear.

GOOD MAYOR

Just as a community which tacitly encourages a lynching deserves the full impact of public scorn, so officials who act sensibly to avert a lynching merit commendation. Hartsboro, Ala., nearly had a lynching Tuesday. A mob had a rope all ready for a Negro youth accused of attempted attack on a white woman. The mayor, Hurt Vann, appeared in time to persuade the crowd to release the prisoner because he said, "That is the best way—we ought to let the law

take its course." This enlightened conception of basic justice implies no sympathy with the alleged crime. It does, however, indicate a growing sensitivity to government by law instead of by mob. That in itself is a step forward. The more public officials can be induced to see their duty as did Mayor Vann, the more their example will serve to put resort to primitive torture on the wane.

Not only does this editorial turn the powerful spotlight of enlightened cordial approval upon a good man incarnating his righteous thought into effective action, but also it again points the moral that such conduct is the only way the crime of lynching is being or can be stopped. Whether demonstrated by officers or by private citizens it is the way, and the only way, that the number of lynchings has been reduced about 99 percent. In 1892, 1 citizen in every 300,000 was lynched. Fifty years later there was 1 in 15,000,000. In 1945 there was none.

Of course, there have been many other murders. Some are called gangster killings, or, if not in the South, they have been described as "done by a group of 500 righteously indignant citizens." But wherever human life is taken, except by due process of law, it is murder or some lesser degree of homicide.

The challenge is to every good citizen so to live that no life may be jeopardized or taken lawlessly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in three instances and include editorials and newspaper articles.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from the Danville (Ill.) Commercial News.

NINETY-SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

THE SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Ninety-Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 16, 1947.

REDUCTION IN INCOME TAX PAYMENTS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 322)

THE SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1, entitled "An act to reduce individual income-tax payments."

The right kind of tax reduction, at the right time, is an objective to which I am deeply committed. But I have reached the conclusion that this bill represents



the wrong kind of tax reduction, at the wrong time. It offers dubious, ill-apportioned, and risky benefits at the expense of a sound tax policy and is, from the standpoint of Government finances, unsafe. Proposals for tax reduction must be examined in the light of sound and carefully related fiscal and economic policies. Unless they are consistent with the demands of such policies, they should not be approved.

In my budget message of January 10, 1947, I said:

As long as business, employment, and national income continue high, we should maintain tax revenues at levels that will not only meet current expenditures but also leave a surplus for retirement of the public debt. There is no justification now for tax reduction.

Developments since January do not warrant a change in that conclusion. Total employment in May increased by a million and a half over that in April, and the total number now employed is over 58,000,000. The number of unemployed is now less than 2,000,000, practically a peace-time minimum. Income payments to individuals are estimated to be at the record annual rate of \$176,000,000. Department store sales in May were up 6 percent over April, and equaled the all-time high in dollar volume. The number of houses begun by private enterprise in May was the largest in any month since VJ-day. Despite many gloomy predictions, there is no convincing evidence that a recession is imminent.

Ample evidence points to the continuation of inflationary pressures. Tax reduction now would increase them. If these pressures are long continued, and if essential readjustments within the price structure are long deferred, we are likely to induce the very recession we seek to avoid.

Reductions in income-tax rates are not required now to permit necessary investment and business expansion. There is no shortage of funds for this purpose in any wide sector of our economy. As a matter of fact, the amount of liquid funds in the hands of corporations and individuals at the present time is nearly \$200,000,000,000. Under these circumstances, tax reduction is not now needed to provide additional funds for business expansion.

The argument is made that the funds added to consumer purchasing power through this tax reduction are needed to maintain employment and production at maximum levels.

It is true, as I have pointed out many times, that the purchasing power of large groups of our people has been seriously reduced. We must take every step possible to remedy the disparity between prices and the incomes of the rank and file of our people, so as not to put brakes on our continued prosperity and lead us toward a recession. Tax reduction as proposed in H. R. 1 is not the proper way to remedy the current price situation and its effect upon consumers and upon prospective employment. Necessary adjustments in incomes, production, and prices should be made by wise policies and improved practices of business and labor, not by hastily invoking the fiscal powers of Government on a broad scale.

The time for tax reduction will come when general inflationary pressures have ceased and the structure of prices is on a more stable basis than now prevails. How long it will take for this point to be reached is impossible to predict. Clearly, it has not been reached as yet. Tax reduction now would add to, rather than correct, maladjustments in the economic structure.

Sound fiscal policy also requires that existing tax rates be maintained for the present. I have always been keenly aware of the necessity for the utmost economy in government and of the need for a progressive reduction in Government expenditures to the greatest extent possible consistent with our national interests. However, necessary expenditures for essential Government operations are still high. We are still meeting heavy obligations growing out of the war. We continue to be confronted with great responsibilities for international relief and rehabilitation that have an important bearing on our efforts to secure lasting peace. We are still in a transition period in which many uncertainties continue. In the face of these facts, common prudence demands a realistic and conservative management of the fiscal affairs of the Government.

A time of high employment and high prices, wages, and profits, such as the present, calls for a surplus in Government revenue over expenditures and the application of all or much of this surplus to the reduction of the public debt. Continuing public confidence in Government finances depends upon such a policy. If the Government does not reduce the public debt during the most active and inflationary periods, there is little prospect of material reduction at any time, and the country would, as a result, be in a poorer position to extend supports to the economy should a subsequent deflationary period develop.

With the present huge public debt, it is of first importance that every effort now be made to reduce the debt as much as possible. If H. R. 1 were to become law, the amount available for debt retirement would be entirely too low for this period of unparalleled high levels of peacetime income and employment.

The integrity of the public debt is the financial bedrock on which our national economy rests. More than half of the American people are direct owners of Government securities. A major portion of the assets of banks, insurance companies, and trust funds is invested in Government bonds. To maintain the integrity of the public debt, we must now reduce it by substantial amounts.

In addition to the fact that this is not the time for tax reduction, there is a fundamental objection to this particular bill. An adjustment of the tax system should provide fair and equitable relief for individuals from the present tax burden, but the reductions proposed in H. R. 1 are neither fair nor equitable. H. R. 1 reduces taxes in the high income brackets to a grossly disproportionate extent as compared to the reduction in the low income brackets. A good tax reduction bill would give a greater proportion of relief to the low-income group.

H. R. 1 fails to give relief where it is needed most. Under H. R. 1, tax savings to the average family with an income of \$2,500 would be less than \$30, while taxes on an income of \$50,000 would be reduced by nearly \$5,000, and on an income of \$500,000 by nearly \$60,000.

Insofar as take-home pay is concerned under H. R. 1, the family earning \$2,500 would receive an increase of only 1.2 percent; the family with an income of \$50,000 would receive an increase of 18.6 percent; and the family with an income of \$500,000 would receive an increase of 62.3 percent.

If H. R. 1 were to become law, the inequity of its provisions would be frozen into the tax structure. The reduction in Government receipts resulting from this bill would be such that the Government could ill afford to make fair tax reductions at the proper time in the form of a carefully considered revision of our entire tax structure.

Now is the time to plan for a thoroughgoing revision of the tax system. We should consider not only individual income tax rates, but also the level of personal exemptions and many other adjustments in the personal income-tax structure. We should also consider changes in excise tax laws, gift, and estate taxes, corporation taxes, and, in fact, the entire field of tax revenues. Such a program of tax adjustment and tax reduction should be geared to the financial and economic needs of this country. It will be an important contribution to economic progress. The timing of such a program is highly important to achieve economic stability, to promote the investment of capital, and to maintain employment, purchasing power and high levels of production.

For the compelling reasons I have set forth, I return H. R. 1 without my approval.

HARRY S. TROMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 16, 1947.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of the veto message on the bill H. R. 1 be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

#### MAKING CRIMINALLY LIABLE PERSONS WHO NEGLIGENTLY ALLOW PRISONERS IN THEIR CUSTODY TO ESCAPE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 26) to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 138 of the Criminal Code (35 Stat. 1113; 18 U. S. C. 244) be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"Whenever any marshal, deputy marshal, ministerial officer, or other person has in his

custody any prisoner by virtue of process issued under the laws of the United States by any court, judge, or commissioner, and such marshal, deputy marshal, ministerial officer, or other person voluntarily suffers such prisoner to escape, he shall be fined not more than \$2,000, or imprisoned not more than 2 years or both. Whenever any marshal, deputy marshal, ministerial officer, or other person has in his custody any prisoner by virtue of process issued under the laws of the United States by any court, judge, or commissioner, and such marshal, deputy marshal, ministerial officer, or other person negligently suffers such prisoner to escape, he shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECOVERY OF UNDERCHARGES AND OVERCHARGES BY CERTAIN COMMON CARRIERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2759) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. KEAN objected.

#### JUDICIAL CODE AND JUDICIARY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3214) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary."

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 966) to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387).

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### SECRETARIES FOR CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2746) to provide secretaries for circuit and district judges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman who considered this bill what appropriation will be necessary to carry it into effect?

Mr. GRAHAM. At the present moment every Federal judge has a secretary. The purpose of this bill is to provide that each circuit judge and each district judge may appoint a secretary and also to provide that each senior cir-

cuit judge and each senior district judge in districts where there are five or more district judges for law clerks for the senior district judges to assist in the expedition and handling of the business. So far as salaries are concerned, there will only be an increase in the salaries of these extra clerks. All other judges have secretaries and clerks at the moment, but due to the action of the Committee on Appropriations, there being no basic law, it was necessary to enact this legislation in order that they may be paid.

Mr. DEANE. How much over and above the amount that was included in the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not familiar with that. I am not able to answer the gentleman.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### PROMOTING UNIFORMITY OF GEOGRAPHIC NOMENCLATURE IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1555) to promote uniformity of geographic nomenclature in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make a brief explanation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will give legal sanction to an important function of the Federal Government which has been carried on for 57 years under an Executive order originally issued by President Benjamin Harrison in 1890. It was introduced by me at the request of the Department of the Interior and has the backing of the Department of State, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Post Office Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and the Central Intelligence Group.

The enactment of this legislation will eliminate duplication of effort in various executive departments and result in a saving to the Government. The Central Intelligence Group, which is charged with the planning and coordination of Government intelligence activities in the United States, asks the passage of the bill for security and national defense.

I have taken advantage of this opportunity to explain the purpose of the meritorious measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2938) to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497; 5 U. S. C., sec. 488),

fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### CAIRO BRIDGE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1610) to amend the act of June 14, 1938, so as to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission to issue its refunding bonds for the purpose of refunding the outstanding bonds issued by the commission to pay the cost of a certain toll bridge at or near Cairo, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission, or the successors of said commission, to acquire by purchase, and to improve, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cairo, Ill., approved June 14, 1938 (Public, No. 601, 75th Cong., 52 Stat. 679), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The power granted to the commission by this act to issue its negotiable bonds for the payment of the cost of said bridge and its approaches and the necessary lands, easements, and appurtenances thereto, shall include the power to refund said bonds, including the payment of any redemption premium thereon, by the issuance of negotiable refunding bonds of the commission, bearing interest at a lower rate or rates, in an aggregate principal amount not in excess of the principal amount of outstanding bonds to be refunded plus the amount of the redemption premium payable on said outstanding bonds at the date of the redemption thereof. All of the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of said act of April 13, 1934, relating to the bridge constructed, to the bonds issued, and to the trust agreement entered into under the authority of said act, and relating to the collection of bridge tolls and to the application of such tolls, shall apply to the bridge acquired and to the bonds issued or to be issued under the authority of this act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TRESPASSING ON NATIONAL FORESTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1826) making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some explanation of what this bill embraces.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this bill reduces the penalty now provided by law for illegal entry into national forests. At present the law provides that the penalty for illegal entry shall be a fine of not more than \$500 and imprisonment for not more than one year. Obviously, that penalty is too severe. So at the request of the Forest Service, this bill



has been introduced, to make the penalty not more than 6 months. That is all there is to the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. How about the fine?

Mr. HOPE. The fine is left just as it is. The fine has been \$500 and it is left at \$500.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. In other words, it does not change the law as it stands except as to lessening the imprisonment.

Mr. HOPE. It changes the law as to the maximum imprisonment that may be imposed.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did I understand the gentleman to say the maximum penalty is \$500?

Mr. HOPE. The maximum penalty is \$500 and one year in jail at present. This bill does not change the maximum penalty as far as the fine is concerned but it does reduce the imprisonment term from 1 year to 6 months.

Mr. HARRIS. Does it have a minimum fine attached to it?

Mr. HOPE. No. There is no minimum.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it was not until the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, indicated that this bill amended existing law that we of the committee were aware of that fact. Certainly the bill itself does not indicate that existing law relating to penalties for trespass is modified in any respect. The report itself does not comply with the rule of the House, known as the Ramsayer rule, if the bill actually does modify existing law. While there is no objection to the bill itself, in order that the report may be complete and everybody understand the full import of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENDING RECLAMATION LAWS TO THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1274) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GATHINGS, and Mr. LARCADE objected; and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

#### VACANCY IN THE OFFICE OF DISTRICT JUDGE IN THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1436) to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the southern district of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to state it seems rather difficult there should be any opposition to this bill which provides for the filling of a vacancy created by the resignation of a district judge in the southern district of New York. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary. It has the approval of the Judicial Conference. It has the approval of the Administrator of the United States Courts. It has the approval of all bar associations having jurisdiction in the southern district of New York. It has the approval of the Department of Justice. It is rather difficult, therefore, to understand why there is objection. I hope, therefore, the gentleman from New York instead of objecting will permit the bill to be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. COLE of New York. That was my request that the bill be passed over.

Mr. CELLER. Excuse me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the bill may be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

#### INCREASING MINIMUM ALLOWANCE PAYABLE FOR REHABILITATION IN SERVICE-CONNECTED CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3308) to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in service-connected cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill involves too much money for consideration on the Consent Calendar.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3309) to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 12 of the Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 771) is hereby amended by repealing the second sentence thereof and substituting the following: "At the general election in 1948 and each such election quadrennially thereafter the Governor of Puerto Rico shall be elected by the qualified voters of Puerto Rico and shall hold office for a term of 4 years commencing on the 2d day of January following the date of the election and until his successor is elected and qualified. No person shall be eligible to election as Governor unless at the time of the election he is a citizen of the United States, is at least 30 years of age, is able to read and write the English language, and has been a bona fide resident of Puerto Rico during the immediately preceding 2 years. Such election shall be held in the manner

now provided by law for the election of the Resident Commissioner."

Sec. 2. Section 12a is hereby added to the Organic Act to read as follows:

"Sec. 12a. The Governor shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors. The House of Representatives of Puerto Rico shall have the sole power of impeachment. Impeachment shall require the concurrence of two-thirds of all the members of the house of representatives. The senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the Governor of Puerto Rico is tried, the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico shall preside. No person shall be convicted without the concurrence of three-fourths of all the members of the senate. Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the Government of Puerto Rico. The person convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment according to law."

Sec. 3. Section 13 of the Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 775) is hereby amended by repealing the second, third, and fourth sentences and substituting the following therefor: "The heads of all executive departments and agencies shall be appointed by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of Puerto Rico. Each shall hold office during the term of the Governor by whom he is appointed and until his successor is qualified, unless sooner removed by the Governor"; and the following is hereby added at the end of the section: "In the event of a vacancy in the office of Governor, or if for any reason the Governor is temporarily absent from Puerto Rico or unable to perform his duties, the attorney general shall act as Governor with all the powers and duties of the office for the remainder of the term in case of a vacancy, or during such temporary absence or disability. If the attorney general is unable to act, the treasurer, the auditor, and such other person as may be provided by the laws of Puerto Rico, in that order, shall act as Governor."

Sec. 4. Section 40 of the Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 861) is hereby amended by changing the colon in the second sentence to a period, by deleting the words following through "States," and by substituting therefor the following: "All vacancies occurring in the offices of the chief justice and associate justices shall be filled by appointment of the Governor by and with the advice of the Senate of Puerto Rico. All justices of the supreme court shall hold office during good behavior."

Sec. 5. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent herewith are repealed to the extent of their inconsistency.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 12 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (48 U. S. C., sec. 771) is hereby amended by repealing the second sentence thereof and substituting the following:

"At the general election in 1948 and each such election quadrennially thereafter the Governor of Puerto Rico shall be elected by the qualified voters of Puerto Rico and shall hold office for a term of four years commencing on the second day of January following the date of the election and until his successor is elected and qualified. No person shall be eligible to election as Governor unless at the time of the election he is a citizen of the United States, is at least thirty years of age, is able to read and write the

English language, and has been a bona fide resident of Puerto Rico during the immediately preceding two years. Such election shall be held in the manner now or hereafter provided by law for the election of the Resident Commissioner."

"Sec. 2. Section 12a is hereby added to said Organic Act to read as follows:

"Sec. 12a. The Governor shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors. The House of Representatives of Puerto Rico shall have the sole power of impeachment. Impeachment shall require the concurrence of two-thirds of all of the members of the House of Representatives. The Senate of Puerto Rico shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose they shall be on oath or affirmation and the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico shall preside. No person shall be convicted without the concurrence of three-fourths of all the members of the Senate. Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the government of Puerto Rico. The person convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment according to law."

"Sec. 3. Section 13 of said Organic Act (48 U. S. C., secs. 773, 775) is hereby amended by repealing the second, third, and fourth sentences and substituting the following therefor: 'The heads of the executive departments set forth in the first sentence of this section shall be appointed by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of Puerto Rico. Each shall hold office during the continuance in office of the Governor by whom he is appointed and until his successor is qualified, unless sooner removed by the Governor.'

"Sec. 4. Section 24 of said Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 772) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 24. In case of a vacancy in the office of the Governor, the person holding the position of Attorney General at the time the vacancy occurs shall succeed to the office of the Governor, and to all the duties and emoluments for the remainder of the term. If for any reason the Governor is temporarily absent from Puerto Rico, or unable to perform his duties, the Attorney General shall act as Governor, with all the powers and duties of the office during such temporary absence or disability. If in such event the Attorney General is unable to act, the Treasurer shall act as Governor, and if the Treasurer is unable to act, such other person as may be provided by the laws of Puerto Rico shall act as Governor during such temporary absence or disability. In the event that because of death or any other reason a newly elected Governor is unable to take office, a temporary successor shall be elected by a majority vote of the full House and Senate of Puerto Rico meeting at a joint session of the legislature at the next succeeding term thereof, who shall hold office until a successor is elected and qualified at a special election to be held within 120 days from the date of adjournment of said session."

"Sec. 5. Section 40 of said Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 861) is hereby amended by changing the colon in the second sentence to a period, by deleting the words following through "States", and by substituting therefor the following: "Until otherwise provided by the Legislature of Puerto Rico, all vacancies hereafter occurring in the offices of the chief justice and associate justices of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico shall be filled by appointment by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of

Puerto Rico. Until otherwise provided by the Legislature of Puerto Rico, all justices of the supreme court shall hold office during good behavior."

"Sec. 6. Section 50 of said Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 797) is hereby amended by deleting the following words from the third sentence thereof: 'appointed by the President and also those appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico.'"

Mr. COLE of New York (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment may be considered as read, and that for purposes of amendment the committee amendment may be considered as an original bill.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to know what the amendment is. I am a member of the committee, but I do not know what the amendment is.

The SPEAKER. It is in the committee print of the bill. If the gentleman has a copy of the bill, he can see what the amendment provides.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Is this H. R. 3372?

The SPEAKER. This is H. R. 3309.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I did not object to the present consideration of this bill, because it is of small value to the people of Puerto Rico and utterly meaningless. I do, however, want to expose its empty and illusory character. It will be utilized by imperialist elements in the United States and by opportunists in Puerto Rico as a means by which to evade and postpone the determination of the basic issue—the status of Puerto Rico. This bill is not a reform in any real sense. The mere election of a Governor of Puerto Rico does not grant to the people of Puerto Rico any sovereignty. It merely adds an embellishing facade on an ugly and rotten colonial structure.

This Puerto Rican question, the question of the political status of that island, has been talked about in this Congress for many years. Last year the President of the United States made a recommendation to Congress requesting that Congress act on the proposal of submitting to the people of Puerto Rico four propositions: The question of independence, the question of present status, the question of statehood, and the question of commonwealth. The President also stated that before submitting any of these questions to the people of Puerto Rico for a choice, Congress should first state in advance which status Congress would be willing to give. He advised us that it would be unfair to present to the people of Puerto Rico certain propositions and then have Congress refuse to grant them that which they had chosen. I took the position then, and reiterate it now, that the only just and realistic referendum that can be submitted is one granting the choice between independence and colonial status.

The President's recommendation was presented to Congress, a bill was intro-

duced in both Houses, hearings were held, but nothing has happened. Now we have this bill. Let no one be deceived. It is offered for the sole purpose of bypassing the issue raised in the President's recommendations. It is offered to avoid granting self-determination to the people of Puerto Rico.

This bill leaves Puerto Rico just where it has been: Subject to the shipping monopolies, subject to the tariff, subject to colonial exploitation, subject to the colonial regime that has been taking the lifeblood out of the people of Puerto Rico.

The people of Puerto Rico want an opportunity to determine for themselves their status in this world. It seems to me that at a time when we speak so much of self-determination and freedom for peoples throughout the world, that we are holding ourselves up for severe condemnation before the people of the world when we refuse to grant to the people of Puerto Rico the right to choose for themselves their own form of government.

Puerto Rico is an island two-thirds the size of Connecticut with a population of 2,000,000 people. Those people have been subjected to the worst kind of exploitation on the part of Wall Street sugar monopolies and various other imperialist groups. The economy of Puerto Rico has been destroyed by that exploitation. The people of Puerto Rico have been deprived of their freedom. Today they are clamoring for it and all we do is to give them this bill, this exhibition of hypocrisy which, again I say, will be used for one purpose and one purpose alone; that is, to evade our responsibility at this time to grant to the people of Puerto Rico the right to self-determination.

I have not objected to the consideration of the bill because I recognize it as an empty gesture. It is not even a realistic reform within the colonial system, but I do not want to deprive the people of Puerto Rico of even this gesture after we have deprived them of so much and so often. Mr. Speaker, we must not permit this bill to be used as a device by which we can escape our responsibility of granting freedom to a people who have a desire for freedom as strong as ours, a tradition for freedom as great as ours, a culture as old as ours, a right to be free which this bill, this gesture must not negate. We must act on the question of Puerto Rico's status now. The people of Puerto Rico, I sincerely believe, want independence—a free Puerto Rico. I am confident that the American people agree with them. Let Congress therefore not evade or postpone. Congress must keep faith with both the people of Puerto Rico and of the United States by granting to Puerto Rico its freedom now.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks a declaration unanimously approved by the Central Committee of the Independence Party of Puerto Rico on May 15, 1947, with respect to this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.



(The matter referred to is as follows:)

A DECLARATION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENCE PARTY OF PUERTO RICO ON MAY 15, 1947, AND ADDRESSED BY THEM TO CHAIRMEN OF THE COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC LANDS AND TERRITORIES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, RESPECTIVELY

The Puerto Rican reform bill now pending consideration by the Congress of the United States, is clearly unsubstantial. In no way does it alter the colonial nature of the regime established in Puerto Rico, to wit: under its provisions, the undemocratic quality of the regime, imposed upon the Puerto Rican people and revocable at the will of the United States Congress, would continue to be.

The amendments thereto added do not change the existing economic colonial structure, not one single concession being made to Puerto Rico through them. We would remain exactly as at present, lacking powers to legislate on the question of the coastwise laws, tariff and customs regulations; to protect the development of our industries against outside competition or to interfere in the drafting of commerce affecting our economy; lacking powers, in sum, of facing our great economic problem with any possibilities of success.

The amendments only aim toward the reorganization of the executive branch of the present government; and there is a probability of having the powers now held by the Governor transferred to the hands of some new officer whose post may be created by Congress and who would act as a direct link between the President of the United States and our colonial government, as well as coordinator of the numerous federal agencies which might then function and their activities.

The authority of our legislative assembly is in no way increased under the bill, nor is its jurisdiction, nor is permanent character conferred the scant powers granted. Our legislative remains as it is now, without even being recognized those simple powers enjoyed by legislative bodies the world over—the right to go over the veto power of the executive and to enact by a two-thirds majority of its members fundamental legislation.

Besides, the powers granted the officers concerned by the amendments proposed are fixed by the Congress of the United States, in whose powers it remains to increase, reduce, or totally eliminate them at will, just as it may also create a new officer, to be known as coordinator, commissioner, auditor, or by any other title, who could declare void, or control or postpone action of the powers to be exercised by officers elected by the people of Puerto Rico.

In no way does the bill increase the powers of the colonial governor to affect the functions of the multiple federal agencies and officers which now are all powerful in Puerto Rico. Nor does it increase the judicial jurisdiction of our courts, while the Federal court continues to act with absolute independence and on the other hand, our "Supreme" Court remains submitted to the jurisdiction of the Boston circuit court and of the Supreme Court of the United States, and—this yet of greater importance—the Congress of the United States continues to exercise its authority over the territory of Puerto Rico and over its people just as if we were chattels, and continues to hold the power to amend, repeal or substitute any laws enacted by our Legislature. Congress likewise retains the powers to legislate for Puerto Rico and the power therewith to deprive us of any concessions which we may now enjoy and to modify the present regime in such a way it may all result a joke.

The amendments proposed are all of a colonial nature, just as the present Jones Act which they pretend to amend is, since they are not to be freely adopted by our parlia-

ment, and they must be passed upon and adopted at its sole discretion by the Congress of the United States, the feelings and will of the Puerto Rican people to the contrary notwithstanding, while they are the most concerned party; and since they may be likewise modified or repealed by that same Congress.

The people of Puerto Rico want irrevocable powers. The powers which only full sovereignty guarantees, in the economic, judicial, social, and cultural orders, so that our collective life may be adequately organized.

Every power which is revocable is thereby of a colonial nature and is likewise unsubstantial. Every revocable power is a mere cheat, an inexcusable cheat, thrust in the face of honest, noble people which through its long history has fought and hoped, while it has received nothing but indifference and disdain from the dominating nation and treason at the hands of politicians whom it trusted.

If this bill were accepted by us without our protest and without a declaration to the effect that the highest interests of the Puerto Rican people demand a definite solution to its problem of sovereignty, may result in postponing that solution for still another 50 years.

The people of Puerto Rico are a highly civilized people, who for at least a century have been worthy of assuming the responsibilities entailed by full sovereignty. In 1897, Spain granted us an autonomous chart by which we were essentially guaranteed such powers of sovereignty as placed our destiny in our own hands. With the American occupation in 1898, we saw those rights trampled upon. First the Foraker Act (1900) and later the Jones Act (1917 up to date), established and maintained on our soil an iniquitous, backward, unjust, overpowering, anachronistic regime, which violates our rights and is as much unworthy of the nation which forcefully imposes it, as to those who in the domineered country, patiently suffer and support it.

The history of Puerto Rico from 1900 up to date, has the character of a tenacious, continued fight to end the colonial regime imposed upon us and for the establishment of a regime founded on right, directly emanating from the will of our people and from the clear principles contained in a constitution freely framed by the people through its legal representatives and ratified in a free election by the voters.

From 1900 up to date our people have resisted the efforts of a minority group of political leaders who have taken shelter under the wing of Puerto Rican independence and pretended to defend our liberties but who really have tried to satisfy the people with what they call reforms liberalizing the regime, in order to come into favor with Washington bureaucrats and settle themselves in the saddle of colonial power, caring nothing about the anguish and agony of the Puerto Rican masses. The Campbell bill, sovereignty within American sovereignty and other such inventions, have been some of the new formulae contrived by colonial politicians in order to reach their objectives of personal profit and power.

Nevertheless, the Puerto Rican people have always defeated these appeasers and selfish men. In recent times, within the old Puerto Rican Liberal Party, the present claudicating leaders of the Popular Democratic Party fought against proposed riders to the independentist platform, to procure the granting of measures liberalizing the regime, jointly with the demand for political independence. The present Popular Party chief, Señor Luis Muñoz Marín, proclaimed at that time and fixed it into the party's platform that more reforms to the regime were not to be sought for. The rest is present-day history. Señor Luis Muñoz Marín split the Liberty Party and pitilessly anathematized and fought the then Liberal chief, Don Antonio R. Barceló, under the pretext of defending independence and

of attacking the colonial regime and any proposed patch to it. Señor Muñoz Marín then said that seeking an elective governor by those having a right to demand independence looked like a man who, having a house to rent, hung this sign on the front door: "To rent for \$200. Will accept \$25." Would any prospective tenant offer more than \$25? was the question then put up to the Puerto Rican people by the one-time independence fighter.

After that Señor Muñoz Marín, while calling himself "president of the Genuine Liberal Party," accused Señor Barceló and Mr. Walter McJones, at that time national committeeman of the Democratic Party of the United States, of seeking reforms in violation of the Liberal Party's platform. In those days Muñoz Marín was self-proclaimed champion of independence and the chief leader of the forces fighting against colonial reforms.

It was at this time that, on the occasion of a document being submitted to the consideration of a United States Senate Commission investigating the general situation in Puerto Rico over the signatures of Don Rafael Martínez Nadal, president of the Puerto Rican Republican-Union Party, and Don Antonio R. Barceló, in which the right to elect our governor and a plebiscite between the solutions of independence and statehood for the future were demanded, that Muñoz Marín accused Martínez Nadal and Barceló of seeking for an alliance which, according to Muñoz Marín, constituted a coalition of reactionary forces. Señor Barceló was accused by Muñoz Marín of "compromising once more arbitrarily and on his own account when his country's destiny was at stake," for seeking the elective governor jointly with the plebiscite promise.

Judging upon the action taken by Barceló and Martínez Nadal, Señor Muñoz Marín then declared:

"I only wish to point out briefly two points in the nature of this pact: (1) That it does not contain any claim for economic powers (the authors of the pact, he added, hastily corrected this revealing defect; but the fact that they overlooked it in the beginning indicates how unsubstantial their real position was); and (2) that it places the cart before the oxen—an old defect in our public life—asking for dilatory reforms of the colonial regime firstly and feebly demanding a plebiscite to solve the political status lastly. Afterward—always afterward. Always later—at any time but not now. Such is the reason to which Puerto Rico has been a victim so many times."

"The logical, the sincere, the intelligent, the honest way," he goes on to say, "is for the people of Puerto Rico to decide before upon its future sovereignty and then upon the basis of such popular decision and in harmony thereto any reforms considered convenient were transitorily established. Any reform which is revocable by the United States Congress is useless to Puerto Rico, unless it be preceded by a decision by the Puerto Rican people itself, based upon a promise by Congress, which would amount to taking an irrevocable decision upon the definite destiny of Puerto Rico, with the consent and by a mandate of the Puerto Rican people themselves.

"The all-important thing is," he then added, "for the people to decide upon its future by itself and without any further delay."

Afterward Señor Muñoz Marín, first in 1940 and later in 1944, sought a popular mandate to definitely and permanently end the colonial regime and agreed to consult the people directly, not later than the moment when world peace would be structured, as to the final political status. Señor Muñoz Marín and with him his most conspicuous co-leaders in his party, declared themselves at that time against the elective governor and against any other colonial reforms.

All that belongs now to the past. It was the prologue. The present is different. Their labor now is quite another. Señor Muñoz Marín today commits "the old treason to which the Puerto Rican people have been a victim so many times." The present chief of colonial government rides against his own history and forgetting the party he split and the men he indicted, asks for, without any authority to that effect, "the sincere backing of every Puerto Rican" for a bill less ample than that backed by Messrs. Barceló and Martínez Nadal and makes ready to go to Washington to ask for amendments which fall short of those he fought against in the past.

That is treason, committed by a leader who delivers his people for a few crumbs of colonial power, forgetting his promises and violating the mandate he received from the people. This is treason. But the people cannot hark to the voice of treason.

The present moment is not—cannot be—the proper one to demand reforms of a minimum, unsubstantial nature. The moment is the right one to demand, clearly and definitely, the liquidation of the present colonial regime and the establishment in Puerto Rico of a sovereign government resulting from the will of the people, for the people, and by the people.

The pledge of the present-day leaders of the Puerto Rican government is that they would demand a definite solution to our political status now. If instead of backing minimum reforms those leaders would rise upon their feebleness and their petty affairs and would courageously and honestly demand the solution of our sovereignty problems, we hold no doubts that their demand would be granted. But if they limit themselves to saying that it is well to get what is given us and they assume an undignified, weak position, they will be doing the same as the landlord who announced he wanted to rent his house for \$200 but would accept \$25.

The position of the Puerto Rico Independence Party, born to political life to bring about the independence of the country, is that nothing should be sought short of recognition of our full sovereignty. Any other position would be contrary to our right, to our dignity, and to this moment of world vindications brought about with the blood and suffering of thousands of Puerto Ricans.

We shall not seek nor ask for colonial reforms. And if, despite the plain right owed us, the present reform bill should be enacted, we shall tell the Congress and the people of the United States, and the entire world likewise, that the concession of an elective governor shall not solve any of our substantial problems. And that we shall continue to demand that we shall use any concessions of a colonial nature given unto our hands to go on demanding political independence and to disclose at every international meeting wherein there may be the occasion so to do, the way in which the right of the Puerto Rican people is trampled under the foot by the leaders of the Nation which tries to assume at this very moment world's democratic leadership.

A governor elected by the Puerto Rican people, under the insignia of the Independence Party, would be in duty bound to be the speaker, before the people and the Government of the United States and before the entire world, for the majority independence forces in Puerto Rico; and would likewise be in duty bound to consider, upon making every appointment to office and on approving all legislative matter submitted to him, that his outstanding obligation as our executive officer would be to bend his every effort to promote, insure, guarantee, and defend the independence of Puerto Rico.

Considering all the aforesaid, we invite the people of Puerto Rico to address themselves to the United States Congress in a lofty, patriotic demand to the effect that our political status be solved now, at once, and that

a government be established in Puerto Rico which may be called a regime of freedom, in harmony with justice owed our people, and with the respect which the United States owes itself.

**Mr. COLE of New York.** Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by **Mr. COLE** of New York to the committee amendment:

On page 7, line 8, strike out the words "Until otherwise provided by the Legislature of Puerto Rico, all" and insert "All."

Page 7, line 13, strike out "until otherwise provided by the Legislature of Puerto Rico, all justices of the Supreme Court shall hold offices during good behavior."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

**Mr. CRAWFORD.** Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by **Mr. CRAWFORD** to the committee amendment:

On page 7, line 20, after section 6, insert: "Sec. 7. Section 3360 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Deposit of internal-revenue collections: Not to exceed 75 percent of all taxes collected under internal-revenue laws of the United States on articles produced in Puerto Rico and transported to the United States, or consumed in the islands, shall be deposited in a special fund of the Treasury of the United States to be available for appropriation by Congress for the construction of public works, hospitals, roads, sewage and water systems, and other public works and for public relief and other public purposes in Puerto Rico."

**Mr. FERNANDEZ.** Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane. The amendment is with respect to the collection of customs. The bill is limited solely to the political aspects of Puerto Rico and solely for the election of a governor and members of the Supreme Court. Furthermore, this amendment is one another committee of the House has jurisdiction over and our committee has not had anything to do with this amendment.

The **SPEAKER.** Does the gentleman from New York [**Mr. MARCANTONIO**] desire to be heard on the point of order?

**Mr. MARCANTONIO.** Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the point of order. This bill seeks to amend the organic act of Puerto Rico. The amendment deals with the tax laws and, consequently, it comes under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. I submit it is not germane, and therefore clearly out of order.

The **SPEAKER.** The Chair is ready to rule.

Unquestionably the amendment proposed is a matter that comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means; therefore not germane to the pending amendment or to the bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EASEMENT TO LONG BEACH, CALIF., FOR STREET PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3252) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes an easement in certain lands within the Navy housing project at Long Beach, Calif.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

**Mr. SHEPPARD.** Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill if he would give me a more definite explanation of what is involved in this transaction?

**Mr. ELSTON.** Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to say to the gentleman that the purpose of H. R. 3252 is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes, an easement in certain lands within the new housing project at Long Beach, Calif.

**Mr. SHEPPARD.** Perhaps we can expedite this. Was there any consideration on the part of Long Beach to the Navy for the easement that was granted?

**Mr. ELSTON.** There is no consideration passing from the city to the Navy Department, and the Navy Department itself will benefit from the improvement.

**Mr. SHEPPARD.** What is there in the easement, if anything, that would obligate an expenditure on the part of the Navy to keep up the streets or any appurtenances thereto?

**Mr. ELSTON.** There is no obligation on the Navy Department to keep up the improvements. That is the obligation of the city.

**Mr. SHEPPARD.** Was this requested by the Navy Department or the city of Long Beach?

**Mr. ELSTON.** It was requested by the Navy Department. The Navy Department appeared before our committee and requested the legislation.

**Mr. SHEPPARD.** I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., on such terms and conditions as he may deem proper, a perpetual easement for street and public-utility purposes, in, over, under, and across two strips of land within the boundaries of Navy housing project CAL-4904N at Long Beach, Calif., said strips being 20 feet in width and 600 and 300 and 30 feet in length, respectively, and being adjacent to the west side of Santa Fe Avenue in the city of Long Beach, the metes and bounds descriptions of which are on file in the Navy Department.

SEC. 2. This grant shall be at no cost to the Government.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EASEMENT FOR PUBLIC HIGHWAY, HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3053) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii an easement for public highway and utility



purposes in certain parcels of land in the district of Ewa, Territory of Hawaii.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to convey to the Territory of Hawaii a perpetual easement for public highway and utility purposes in, over, under, and across 28 parcels of land, containing thirteen and eighty-eight one-thousandths acres of land, situated in the vicinity of Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in the district of Ewa, island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, the metes and bounds description of which are on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EASEMENT FOR GEORGIA PUBLIC ROAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3056) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., an easement for public road and utility purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., under such terms and conditions as he may deem in the Government's interest, a perpetual easement for public road and utility purposes, in, under, over, and across a 50½-foot strip of land at the naval ordnance plant, Macon, Ga., containing approximately ninety-one one-hundredths acre of land, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department: *Provided*, That said grant shall be at no cost to the Government: *Provided, further*, That such conveyance shall contain an express provision that neither the city of Macon, Ga., nor Bibb County, Ga., shall at any time build any residences or other customarily occupied buildings within 1,000 feet of the present south boundary of the naval ordnance plant, Macon, Ga.: *And provided further*, That such conveyance shall contain an express provision that the said grantees shall not dispose of the property owned by them within such a distance without first giving the United States an opportunity to purchase the property, on such terms and conditions as may then be agreed upon by the parties.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RETIRED BOARDS TO CONSIDER CASES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3251) to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman in charge of this bill would explain to the House just what it consists of? It seems to be very meritorious, but it carries an estimated cost of \$52,500. Would the gentleman explain it, please?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON, to answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is general legislation, but I have an individual case that is covered by this bill. Under existing law a temporary officer of the Navy or Marine Corps, who was an enlisted man of the Regular Navy before he became an officer, cannot be retired for physical disability unless he appears before a retiring board within 6 months from the date of his discharge. There are some 50 former enlisted men who, at the time of their retirement, were temporary officers but who were unable to appear before retiring boards because in many instances—and in the individual case in which I am interested—the officer was bedridden. Further, the 6 months' limitation applies to enlisted men but does not apply to officers of the Regular Navy. This bill is endorsed by the Navy Department, by the Bureau of the Budget, and unanimously by the Armed Services Committee. I understood there would be no objection from the objectors on either side of the House.

Mr. BROOKS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent bill. It removes the discrimination against the enlisted man. Where the officer has an opportunity to file his application, the enlisted man is denied it because of the lapse of time. I think that is one reason this is an excellent bill.

Mr. DEANE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That subsection 8 (d) of the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604; 34 U. S. C. 350g (d)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) An officer of the retired list of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps who incurs physical disability while serving on active duty in the same rank as that held by him on the retired list shall, if not otherwise entitled thereto, receive 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which he was entitled while serving in that rank."

Sec. 2. Subsection 8 (e) of the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604; 34 U. S. C. 350g (e)), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the words "the next" as they appear in line 4 thereof and substituting therefor the word "such."

Sec. 3. Subsection 8 (g) of the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605; 34 U. S. C. 350g (g)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(g) The provisions of this section shall not apply in any case if the proceedings of the naval retiring board be commenced subsequent to a date 6 months after the termination of the temporary appointment or release from active duty of the individual concerned, whichever may occur later, except in the case of an individual whose temporary appointment shall have been terminated prior to the date of enactment of this amendment, or who, prior to such date, shall have been released from active duty."

Sec. 4. This act shall become effective as of August 10, 1946, and no back pay for any period prior thereto shall accrue to any person by reason of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 13, strike out "six months" and insert "one year."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADMISSION OF ALIEN SPOUSES AND CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3149) to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (Pub. Law 271, 79th Cong.), entitled "An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act approved December 28, 1945 (Pub. Law 271, 79th Cong., ch. 591, 1st sess.) (59 Stat. 659; 8 U. S. C. 232-236), is amended by adding a new section thereto, to be known as section 6, and to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. The alien spouse of an American citizen by a marriage occurring before January 1, 1947, shall not be considered as inadmissible because of race, if otherwise admissible under this act."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "January 1, 1947" and insert "30 days after the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADMISSION OF ALIEN FIANCÉES OR FIANCÉS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3398) to extend the period of validity to the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JAVITS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I call attention to an unusual situation which arises as a result of this bill, and perhaps to the growth of a practice of which many of us will disapprove heartily. It amounts to this:

By rulings now in effect, German girls who are engaged to American soldiers may also take advantage of the provisions not of this bill, but of similar provisions, on the theory that American soldiers engaged to German girls should have the benefit of this immigration procedure for their fiancées. This bill, which is here on the Consent Calendar, does not apply to these German girls as it relates only to nationals of countries whose immigration quota has been exhausted, while the German quota is open. German citizens other than DP's and refugees are generally not receiving visas. But—and this is the big point—these German girls get not temporary visas, as do other nationals under the pending bill, but permanent visas; so that when they get into the United States, and if their plans for marriage fail—and they are required, before getting their visas, to submit proof that they are seriously expecting to marry when they get here—

they may stay here as permanent residents. Thus they can get a preference over Germans other than German DP's and refugees, despite the fact that it is our national policy to keep such Germans out at the present time.

I would, therefore, urge the Committee on the Judiciary to look into this question very carefully with a view to determining if an amendatory law is required, in order to avoid giving these German girls a better opportunity in entering the United States than is given to the fiancées of GI's from other countries which were our allies in World War II whose quotas are exhausted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the authority conferred upon the Secretary of State and the Attorney General under the provisions of the act approved June 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 339), shall be extended to December 31, 1947, midnight.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PLAN FOR HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3072) to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the erection of an addition or extension to the House Office Buildings and the remodeling of the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will my colleague from New Jersey explain the bill?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I will be very glad to.

This bill authorizes the Architect of the Capitol to draw up preliminary plans for an increase in office space in the Old House Office Building or the erection of a new House Office Building for the accommodation of our Members' offices. The demand for offices is so great right now that there is no extra space available for anyone or any committee. This makes it imperative that something be done to relieve the situation. A similar measure has been passed by the Senate to relieve the office congestion over there. It is hoped that if this bill is passed and favorably acted upon we may soon be able to have some concrete plans worked out for this relief.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman left the wrong impression with the House. The bill provides for plans for remodeling of the Old House Office Building rather than the construction of a new House Office Building.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. The construction of a new House Office Building was one of the plans submitted, if the gentleman will recall, to the committee when this matter was considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Architect of the Capitol, subject to the direction and supervision of the House Office Building Commission, is authorized and directed to prepare preliminary plans and estimates of cost for (1) the erection of an addition or extension to the House Office Buildings for the use of the United States House of Representatives, including accommodations for parking of automobiles; (2) the remodeling of the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building to provide additional office accommodations for Members of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for such purpose the sum of \$25,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the semicolon insert "and (3) the renewal of plumbing in the Old House Office Building."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NAVAL AVIATION CADET ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2314) to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, as amended, so as to authorize lump-sum payments under the said act to the survivors of deceased officers without administration of estates.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 738), as amended by the act of October 25, 1943 (57 Stat. 574), as so amended, is hereby further amended by striking out that part of the said section which appears before the first proviso thereof and substituting therefor the following: "When officers commissioned pursuant to this act or the Naval Aviation Reserve Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 819) are released from active duty that has been continuous for one or more years, they shall be paid a lump sum of \$500 for each complete year of continuous commissioned active service, or, in the event of the death of such officers, after continuous active duty for one or more years, the beneficiaries specially designated in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy may be paid such sum, or, if no beneficiary has been specially designated and no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the deceased officer's estate, the decedent's widow, or legal heirs may be paid such sum in the following order of precedence: First, to the widow; second, if the decedent left no widow, or the widow be dead at the time of settlement, then to the children or their issue, per stirpes; third, if no widow or descendants, then to the father and mother in equal parts; fourth, if either the father or mother be dead, then to the one surviving; fifth, if there be no widow, child, father, or mother at the date of settlement, then to the brothers and sisters and children of deceased brothers and sisters, per stirpes; and in the event of the death of such officers not the result of their own misconduct, or if released from active duty otherwise than upon their own request or as a result of disciplinary action, this lump-sum payment shall be prorated for fractional parts of each year of such service."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "officers", add a comma, and strike out the words "after continuous active duty for 1 or more years."

On page 2, line 7, strike out the word "may" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "shall."

On page 2, line 11, strike out the word "may" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "shall."

Add a new section, numbered section 2, as follows:

"Sec. 2. Section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1524), as amended by section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 559), as amended by section 6 of the act of June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 240), as so amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end of the section the following: 'Provided, That in the event of the death of such officer, the beneficiaries specially designated in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of War shall be paid such sum, or, if no beneficiary has been specially designated and no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the deceased officer's estate, the decedent's widow or legal heirs shall be paid such sum in the following order of precedence: First, to the widow; second, if the decedent left no widow, or the widow be dead at the time of settlement, then to the children or their issue, per stirpes; third, if no widow or descendants, then to the father and mother in equal parts; fourth, if either the father or mother be dead, then to the one surviving; fifth, if there be no widow, child, father, or mother at the date of settlement, then to the brothers and sisters and children of deceased brothers and sisters, per stirpes; and in the event of the death of such officer, not the result of his own misconduct, this lump-sum payment shall be prorated for fractional parts of each year of such service.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, as amended, and to amend section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936, as amended, so as to authorize lump-sum payments under the said acts to the survivors of deceased officers without administration of estates."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES IN THE SENATE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 125) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 3 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of such subsection the following:

"For the purposes of this act, the Official Reporters of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters shall be deemed to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government, and service heretofore or hereafter rendered as an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate



or as a person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters shall be deemed to be service as an officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government. The provisions of this act shall not apply to any such Official Reporter or person employed by them until he gives notice in writing to the said Official Reporters of his desire to come within the purview of this act. In the case of any such Official Reporter or person employed by them who is in service on the date of enactment of this subsection, such notice of desire to come within the purview of this act must be given within 6 months after such date. In the case of any such Official Reporter or person employed by them who enters the service subsequent to the date of enactment of this subsection, such notice of desire to come within the purview of this act must be given within 6 months after the date of such entrance into the service. No provision of this or any other act relating to automatic separation from the service shall be applicable to any such Official Reporter or person employed by them."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMANENT CENSUS OFFICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1045) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed an identical bill, S. 614, which is on the Speaker's table. I ask unanimous consent that the identical Senate bill, S. 614, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 7 of the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (U. S. C., title 13, sec. 111), is amended by adding at the end of the first sentence thereof the words: "Provided, That where the doctrine, teaching, or discipline of any religious denomination or church prohibits the disclosure of information relative to membership, such information shall not be required."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1045) was laid on the table.

#### CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3511) to extend the provisions of section 1 (e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, until June 30, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the

author of the bill if this is the bill which extends the provisions of the bill sponsored last year by me and which was signed by the President on August 2, which takes care of those Federal employees who are discharged or demoted as a result of the reduction of personnel in Federal departments?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FORAND. There is another bill pending that would strike out the age clause of 55. This does not strike out the age clause requirement of 55 in the bill, does it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; it does not.

Mr. FORAND. It merely extends the date?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; for 1 year.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the committee will see fit to take up the other bill striking out the 55-year clause and also eliminate the termination date because we are gradually throwing out of the Government people who have had 25, 28, and 30 years of service who have not yet reached the retirement age.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 1 (e) (1) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1948."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MILITARY LEAVE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1845) to amend section 371, title 10, United States Code (military leave for Federal employees).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 371, title 10, United States Code, be amended by adding the words "and the Enlisted Reserve Corps" following the words "the Officers' Reserve Corps" wherever the latter appears in said section.

With the following committee amendment:

2. Strike out all after the enacting clause and add the following:

"(a) That the third and fourth paragraphs under the subheading 'Ordnance stores and equipment for Reserve Officers' Training Corps' in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes,' approved May 12, 1917 (40 Stat. 72; 10 U. S. C. A. 371), are hereby amended by inserting in each such paragraph, after the words 'the Officers' Reserve Corps,' the words 'or the Enlisted Reserve Corps.'

"(b) The fourth paragraph under the subheading 'Ordnance stores and equipment for Reserve Officers' Training Corps' of the act of May 12, 1917, as amended, as it appears on page 72, volume 40, Statutes at Large, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the said paragraph, substituting a colon therefor, and adding the follow-

ing proviso: 'Provided further, That no existing law shall be construed to prevent any member of the Officers' Reserve Corps or the Enlisted Reserve Corps from accepting employment in any civil branch of the public service nor from receiving the pay incident to such employment in addition to any pay and allowances to which he may be entitled under the laws relating to the Officers' Reserve Corps and Enlisted Reserve Corps, nor as prohibiting him from practicing his civilian profession or occupation before or in connection with any department of the Federal Government.'

"Sec. 2. Section 80 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 203; 32 U. S. C. 75), is hereby amended by striking out the period as it appears at the end of the said section, substituting a comma therefor, and adding the following: 'for periods not to exceed 15 days in any one calendar year: Provided, That all members of the National Guard who are in the employ of the United States Government or of the District of Columbia and who are ordered to duty by proper authority shall, when relieved from duty, be restored to the positions held by them when ordered to duty: And provided further, That no existing law shall be construed to prevent any member of the National Guard from accepting employment in any civil branch of the public service nor from receiving the pay incident to such employment in addition to any pay and allowances to which he may be entitled under the provisions of law relating to the National Guard, nor as prohibiting him from practicing his civilian profession or occupation before or in connection with any department of the Federal Government.'

"Sec. 3. Section 9 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1177; 34 U. S. C. A. 853g), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the period as it appears at the end of the said section, substituting a colon therefor, and adding the following proviso: 'And provided further, That all members of the Naval Reserve who are in the employ of the United States Government or of the District of Columbia and who are ordered to duty by proper authority shall, when relieved from duty, be restored to the positions held by them when ordered to duty.'

"Sec. 4. The words 'officers and employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia' as used in the third paragraph, subheading 'Ordnance stores and equipment for Reserve Officers' Training Corps,' of the act of May 12, 1917 (40 Stat. 72; 10 U. S. C. A. 371), as now or hereafter amended, as used in that part of section 80 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 203; 32 U. S. C. 75), as now or hereafter amended, which precedes the proviso, and as used in the first proviso of section 9 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1177; 34 U. S. C. A. 853g), as now or hereafter amended, shall be construed to mean all officers and employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia, permanent, or temporary indefinite, without regard to classifications or terminology peculiar to the Federal Civil Service System."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2826) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE WITH RESPECT TO MANUFACTURE OF WINES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1945) to amend sections 2801 (e) (4), 3043 (a), and 3045 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman from California explain this bill, and he might also make a brief reference to the next two bills on the calendar.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to the floor with the unanimous endorsement of the Ways and Means Committee. It is what you might call a wine industry modernization bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. California wine?

Mr. GEARHART. Affecting California wine, yes. The changes which will be effected are all technical in their nature. The bill was prepared by representatives of the Wine Institute, to which nearly all wine concerns belong, in collaboration and consultation with the Internal Revenue Bureau. The Treasury has no objection to the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. And briefly about the next two bills.

Mr. GEARHART. The next two bills are of the same character. They are industry bills which have been prepared in consultation with the Treasury, and the Treasury has no objection to their enactment.

Mr. McCORMACK. What particular industry do the other two relate to?

Mr. GEARHART. The same favored industry.

Mr. McCORMACK. Wine?

Mr. GEARHART. Wine, the finest of wine.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am well acquainted with it during my 10 years' experience on the Ways and Means Committee.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, until the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] undertook to answer the inquiries of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] it had been my understanding that this bill had relationship to wines produced all over the continental United States. I did not realize that it was directed primarily and principally to the wines made in California. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from California if this and the next two succeeding bills will not apply

to wines made in New York State as well as those made in California?

Mr. GEARHART. If I have given any impression that the bill is confined in its operation to California such was not my intention. The bill will apply to all of the States of the Union, as is customary with legislation passed in this House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The inference was drawn from my friend's observations and mine; wine and California. The gentleman comes from California. So he is, with usual zeal, looking after the interests of his people, which in the case of any Member, properly exercised, is an important duty.

Mr. GEARHART. I must add that in the minds of a great many people the words wine and California are synonymous, both in fame and excellence.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is why I took the floor, to make sure that New York was also considered as a wine-producing State and covered by the legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Internal Revenue Code be, and it is hereby, amended as follows:

1. Section 2801 (e) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended (a) by deleting from the second sentence thereof the words "having no interior communication with any other department or part of such premises", and (b) by adding immediately at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of this paragraph shall apply in the same manner and to the same extent to aperitif wines other than vermouth."

2. Section 3045, Internal Revenue Code, is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "Provided, That in the case of wines produced from loganberries, currants, or gooseberries, respectively, having a normal acidity of twenty parts or more per thousand, the volume of the resultant product may be increased more than 35 per centum but not more than 60 per centum by the addition of sugar and water solution under such regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may prescribe."

3. Section 3043 (a), Internal Revenue Code, is amended by deleting the colon in the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", nor to apply to or prohibit the fermentation of grape wine retsina with resin on bonded winery premises."

4. Section 3044 (b), Internal Revenue Code, is amended by deleting the words "and not more than 13 per centum of alcohol after complete fermentation," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and not more than 13 per centum of alcohol after complete fermentation of, if sweetened, after complete fermentation and sweetening."

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, there was an amendment. If it is not in the bill, I offer it at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEARHART as a committee amendment: In the title of the bill insert after the figure "3043 (a)," the figure "3044 (b)."

On page 2, rearrange sections 2, 3, and 4 in their correct order, renumbering section 3 section 2; renumbering section 4 section 3; and renumbering section 2 section 4.

On page 2, line 22, in section 4, as the bill is now drawn, prior to the foregoing amendment, strike out the word "of" following the word "fermentation" and insert in lieu thereof "or."

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. That request comes too late. We have already read amendments to the bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Then I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The objection comes too late.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

## PERMITTING THE BLENDING AND AGING OF BRANDIES IN BOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1946) to amend section 2801 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That subsection (e) of section 2801 of the Internal Revenue Code be, and it is hereby, amended by adding the following new numbered paragraph:

"(5) Blending of beverage brandies: Fruit brandies distilled from the same kind of fruit at not more than 170 degrees proof may, for the sole purpose of perfecting such brandies according to commercial standards, be mixed or blended with each other, or with any such mixture or blend, by the distiller thereof in any internal revenue bonded warehouse operated by him exclusively for the storage of brandy or wine spirits, and the provisions of this section and of sections 2800 (a) (5) and 3254 (g) relating to rectification or other internal revenue laws of the United States shall not be held to apply to or prohibit such mixing or blending, and brandies so mixed or blended may be packaged, stored, transported, transferred in bond, withdrawn from bond tax-paid or tax-free, or be otherwise disposed of, in the same manner as such brandies not so mixed or blended: *Provided*, That, in addition to the tax imposed by this chapter on the production of distilled spirits, there shall be paid a tax of 30 cents as to each proof gallon (and a proportionate tax at a like rate on all fractional parts of such proof gallon) of brandy so mixed or blended (except when withdrawn tax-free and accounted for or when lost and allowance is made therefor), such tax to be paid by rectified spirits stamps affixed to the packages at the time of withdrawal. The Commissioner, under rules and regulations to be by him prescribed with the approval of the Secretary, upon the presentation of proof to his satisfaction of the loss by leakage, evaporation, theft, or otherwise of fruit brandies so blended or mixed, not occurring as the result of any negligence, connivance, collusion, or fraud on the part of the warehouseman or his agents, is hereby authorized to remit or refund the taxes assessed or paid upon such lost brandies: *Provided, however*, That such remission or refund shall be allowed only to the extent that the warehouseman is not indemnified or recompensed for such tax, and that losses of fruit brandies occurring prior to any such mixing or blending shall be allowable in accordance with section 2901. The term 'distiller' as used herein shall include any one or more distillers associated as members of



any farm cooperative, or any one or more distillers affiliated within the meaning of section 17 (a) (5) of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended, or any fruit distiller for whose account, recorded with the district supervisor at the time of production, the brandy to be blended was produced. The Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary, make such rules or regulations as he may deem necessary to carry these provisions into effect."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LIMITING LIABILITY OF STOCKHOLDERS AND OTHERS IN REGISTERED DISTILLERIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1947) to amend section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Every proprietor or possessor of any still, distillery, or distilling apparatus, and every person in any manner interested in the use of such still, distillery, or distilling apparatus, shall be jointly and severally liable for the taxes imposed by law on the distilled spirits produced therefrom: *Provided,* That in the case of a registered distillery or registered fruit distillery any person so interested other than the proprietor, shall be liable under this subsection for such taxes only if such person (1) has defrauded, or aided or abetted in defrauding, the United States of such taxes, or (2) has profited, directly or indirectly, by the receipt of dividends or otherwise, from any defrauding or evading of payment of such taxes, in which event he shall be liable only to the extent of such profits."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. J. Res. 193) to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Works if he will kindly undertake an explanation of this bill, for the reason that it appears to me to be a very unusual measure in that the Congress is giving consent to a local charitable institution to construct out of its own funds a building upon public ground and that after the building is erected the title to the building shall be in the United States Government.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the American Red Cross appeared before our committee, indicating that they desired to erect a building here that would cost probably a million and a half dollars, on property which belongs to the United States.

It may be somewhat new to many Members to know that the title to the property on which the present Red Cross Buildings stand here in the District of

Columbia is in the name of the United States. The Red Cross has its own money but they cannot build without the consent of the Congress of the United States.

Every agency of Government to which this bill has been submitted has reported favorably. There is no objection whatever, and there is no cost to our Government. The Government has the land. Because of certain recent developments in the District the Red Cross is forced to vacate some buildings which they have occupied rent free for a long period of time. They must move out. They are preparing the plans to build the building. Consent of Congress is needed to facilitate the construction of this "workshop" as the Red Cross calls it, a workshop badly needed here in the District of Columbia for this particular organization.

Mr. COLE of New York. But why is it necessary to have the consent of Congress as a prerequisite to the construction of the building?

Mr. DONDERO. Because it is going to be on land title to which is in the United States Government, and they are not permitted to erect a building on that land without the consent of Congress.

Mr. COLE of New York. If it is possible for them to put up a building on public land others might likewise get the consent of Congress.

Mr. DONDERO. That might be possible. I am in no position to answer that, but I presume the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. I can understand that it is entirely worth while for a charitable or eleemosynary institution of a Nation-wide character; but when we grant this authority to a local chapter of a national organization it seems to me we are establishing a precedent which may someday rise up to plague us. I want to make sure that the Committee on Public Works has considered the possible danger from that source.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to a committee amendment which will add section 10 to the bill and which takes care of the very question the gentleman raises.

Mr. COLE of New York. That still will not make it impossible for a person in future years to say that this is a precedent in spite of the fact that the bill itself says it shall not be construed as a precedent.

Mr. DONDERO. Being here in the Nation's Capital, however, we think it deserves special consideration over any other chapter throughout the United States.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That authority be, and is hereby, given to the American National Red Cross to erect upon the south half of square 104 in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, a permanent building for the use of the District of Columbia Chapter, Amer-

ican National Red Cross in connection with its work, in cooperation with the Government of the United States and its responsibilities under its charter granted by the Congress of the United States.

Sec. 2. That the plans of the proposed building shall first be approved by the American National Red Cross, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the erection and design thereof shall be under the supervision of the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency in accordance with the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926, as amended and as hereby further amended.

Sec. 3. That the cost of the removal of the buildings on this site shall be borne by the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, without expense to the United States.

Sec. 4. That said permanent building shall remain the property of the United States but under the supervision of the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency and the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, shall, at all times be charged with the responsibility, care, keeping, and maintenance of said building without expense to the United States.

Sec. 5. That moneys of the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia chapter, available for the construction of the aforesaid building, including any amount administratively determined necessary for the payment of salaries and expenses of personnel engaged upon the preparation of plans and specifications, field supervision, and general office expenses, may be transferred to and expended by the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency, and such funds may be consolidated on the books of the Treasury Department into a special account for direct expenditure in the prosecution of said work, and the Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to prepare drawings and specifications for this building prior to the approval by the Attorney General of the title to such acquisition.

Sec. 6. That said building shall be appropriate in design and character and shall be used by the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia chapter, and shall cost not less than \$1,000,000: *Provided,* That this expenditure shall include complete equipment.

Sec. 7. That the person, firm, or corporation which the Commissioner of Public Buildings shall select to furnish professional architectural and engineering services required for the project shall be chosen from nominations made by the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia chapter.

Sec. 8. That the National Capital Housing Authority is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Administrator such part of the site for said building as is now under the jurisdiction of said Authority: *Provided,* That the Treasurer of the United States is authorized and directed to credit said Authority with the fair market value, at the date of transfer, of the property so transferred: *Provided further,* That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to utilize the property so transferred, as well as that part of the site already under his jurisdiction, for the purposes of this act.

Sec. 9. That the Federal Works Administrator, through the Public Buildings Administration, is hereby authorized to furnish steam from the central heating plant for the heating of said building, such steam to be paid for by the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia chapter, at such reasonable rates, not less than cost, as may be determined by the Federal Works Administrator: *Provided,* That the Federal Works Administrator, through the Public Buildings Administration, is authorized to prepare plans and specifications and to super-

wise and to contract for the work necessary to connect said building with the Government mains and to pay the cost of such work and services, including administrative expenses, from the funds consolidated into the Treasury pursuant to section 5 thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, after line 21, add a new section as follows:

"Sec. 10. The enactment of this joint resolution shall not be construed as establishing a policy of the United States Government to furnish building sites for Red Cross chapters or any eleemosynary institution at any other place."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DEATH GRATUITIES FOR SERVICE PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1380) to amend the laws relating to the payment of 6 months' death gratuity to dependents of naval personnel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the provision contained in the act approved June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 824), as amended (34 U. S. C., Supp. 943), is hereby further amended by striking out the words "not the result of his or her own misconduct," wherever appearing therein.

Sec. 2. The act of May 12, 1930 (46 Stat. 168, 34 U. S. C. 944), entitled "An act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to beneficiaries of transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who die while on active duty," is hereby amended by striking out the words "and not as a result of their own misconduct," appearing therein.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 4, insert the following: "Sec. 3. The act of December 17, 1919, chapter 6 (41 Stat. 367), entitled 'An act to provide for the payment of 6 months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct,' as amended (10 U. S. C. 903), is further amended by striking out the words 'not the result of his own misconduct,' wherever appearing therein."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to amend the laws relating to the payment of 6 months' death gratuity to dependents of naval and Army personnel."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUDIT OF RECORDS OF ACCOUNTABLE OFFICERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3138) to provide for the periodic audit of the records of the accountable officers of the Senate and House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Comptroller General of the United States shall, not less frequently than once each year, detail assistants to audit the fiscal records of accountable officers of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States and shall report to the respective Houses on the results of each such audit.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FOREST PEST CONTROL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1974) to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the author of this bill will give us some indication as to the possible cost.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, having introduced this bill I am very glad indeed to answer the gentleman's inquiry. I may say that no new appropriation is expected to be requested at this session under this bill, which is designed to provide cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, and private agencies in controlling infestations of our forests by insect pests.

One of the basic reasons for submitting the bill is that in the infestation of forest areas by defoliators, bark beetles, and other destructive forest insect pests often the area infested includes private timber lands, State timber lands, and also Federal timber lands. This Congress earlier in the session, due to a heavy infestation by the tussock moth, a defoliator, in northern Idaho, my district, made an appropriation to eradicate this pest. It was provided in that appropriation bill for cooperation with State and private owners. This provision for cooperative effort might have been subject to a point of order on the floor had such point been raised, but it was not, and the control campaign is now going on.

The State of Idaho appropriated \$210,000 to combat the pest, the private owners put up something over \$100,000, this Congress \$375,000, and joining efforts DDT is being sprayed by airplane. When one of these infestations comes it is hardly effective to just fight the pest on Federal land or State land or private land for the control measures must cover the whole of the infested area.

The bill provides that when any Federal money is used the Forest Service may provide what cooperation will take place from the other owners that are interested. May I say also that I claim no pride of authorship because the same bill was introduced in the Senate and I invite attention to No. 176 on today's calendar, an identical bill, which passed the Senate and is over here for consideration. Thus this bill has the unanimous approval of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senate and our own committee on Agriculture. The pro-

cedures outlined by the bill are not only of the highest importance to my own State but to the future protection of every forest area in the United States.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOFF. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. May I say for the benefit of the Members of the House, in answering the inquiry of the gentleman, that the present appropriation—the one for the present fiscal year—is \$480,000. In other words, that is the amount which is now being appropriated for the sort of thing which this bill seeks to do. The bill, however, authorizes a more efficient use of that money because it will permit the Federal Government to cooperate with State and private owners. At the present time the Federal Government has no authority at all to go into a cooperative deal, even where land ownerships are mixed. You can appreciate the inefficiency of trying to control insects on Federal land, where the adjacent private landowner is not doing anything or where the State is not doing anything on contiguous land. This bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to go into a cooperative agreement with the other landowners for the purpose of fighting those insects on a cooperative basis. It does not provide any money. It merely provides for a more efficient use of the money which the Congress may see fit to make available for this purpose.

Mr. GOFF. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 597, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in order to protect and preserve forest resources of the United States from ravages of bark beetles, defoliators, blights, wilts, and other destructive forest insect pests and diseases, and thereby enhance the growth and maintenance of forests, promote the stability of forest-using industries and employment associated therewith, aid in fire control by reducing the menace created by dying and dead trees injured or killed by insects or disease, conserve forest cover on watersheds, and protect recreational and other values of forests, it shall be the policy of the Government of the United States independently and through cooperation with the governments of States, Territories, and possessions, and private-timber owners to prevent, retard, control, suppress, or eradicate incipient, potential, or emergency outbreaks of destructive insects and diseases on, or threatening, all forest lands irrespective of ownership.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized either directly or in cooperation with other departments of the Federal Government, with any State, Territory, or possession, organization, person, or public agency, subject to such conditions as he may deem necessary and using such funds as have been, or may hereafter be, made available



for these purposes, to conduct surveys on any forest lands to detect and appraise infestations of forest insect pests and tree diseases, to determine the measures which should be applied on such lands, in order to prevent, retard, control, suppress, or eradicate incipient, threatening, potential, or emergency outbreaks of such insect or disease pests, and to plan, organize, direct, and carry out such measures as he may deem necessary to accomplish the objectives and purposes of this act: *Provided*, That any operations planned to prevent, retard, control, or suppress insects or diseases on forest lands owned, controlled, or managed by other agencies of the Federal Government shall be conducted with the consent of the agency having jurisdiction over such land.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion and out of any money made available pursuant to this act, make allocations to Federal agencies having jurisdiction over lands held or owned by the United States in such amounts as he may deem necessary to retard, control, suppress, or eradicate injurious insect pests or plant diseases affecting forests on said lands.

SEC. 4. No money appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act shall be expended to prevent, retard, control, or suppress insect or disease pests on forest lands owned by persons, associations, corporations, States, Territories, possessions, or subdivisions thereof until such contributions toward the work as the Secretary may require have been made or agreed upon in the form of funds, services, materials, or otherwise.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary. Any sums so appropriated shall be available for necessary expenses, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, and the purchase, maintenance, operation, and exchange of passenger-carrying vehicles; but such sums shall not be used to pay the cost or value of any property injured or destroyed. Materials and equipment necessary to control, suppress, or eradicate infestations of forest insects or tree diseases may be procured without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) under such procedures as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, when deemed necessary in the public interest.

SEC. 6. The provisions of this act are intended to supplement, and shall not be construed as limiting or repealing, existing legislation.

SEC. 7. This act may be cited as the "Forest Pest Control Act."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1974) was laid on the table.

#### INCLUSION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ANGOSTURA PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2167) to authorize the inclusion within the Angostura water conservation and utilization project of certain lands owned by the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, "That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to add to and make a part of the Angostura water conservation and utilization project, situated in Custer and Fall River Counties, S. Dak., and established pursuant to the provisions of the act of August 11, 1939, as amended (16 U. S. C. (and Supp.) 590y-590z-11), any lands of the United States acquired under the provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act,

approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, approved April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115), or title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm-Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010-1013), within the Bad Lands-Fall River land utilization project, administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, which are found to be suitable for water conservation and utilization purposes. All lands so added to and made a part of the Angostura water conservation and utilization project shall thereafter be subject to all laws applicable to agricultural lands acquired under the provisions of section 5 (a) of the act of August 11, 1939, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590z-3 (a)); the costs incurred by the United States in acquiring such lands, as well as the costs incurred in the improvement thereof for water conservation and utilization purposes, shall be returned in the same manner as though such lands had been acquired under the provisions of said section 5 (a).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, following the word "Angostura", strike out the words "water conservation and utilization" and substitute in lieu thereof "unit of the Missouri Basin."

Page 2, line 7, following the word "for", strike out the words "water conservation and utilization purposes." and substitute in lieu thereof "such transfer."

Page 2, line 9, following the word "Angostura" strike out the words "water conservation and utilization project" and substitute in lieu thereof "unit."

Page 2, line 15, following the word "for", strike out the words "water conservation and utilization" and substitute in lieu thereof "irrigation."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time and passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota to the title of the bill: Strike out "water conservation and utilization" and insert "unit of the Missouri Basin."

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONSERVATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE OF UPPER MISSISSIPPI

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 2721) to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have this bill explained.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this bill simply provides and directs full consideration and recognition of the needs of fish and other wildlife on the part of the United States Engineer Corps in maintaining certain pool levels in the upper Mississippi River during the wintertime. The bill does not apply to the navigation season and only requires cooperation during the winter months of the year when we have several feet of ice on the river. It was the practice during the wartime for the War Department to draw down the pools and virtually drain some of the pools during the winter

months, and thousands of tons of fish were destroyed or smothered at the time because the water was removed leaving the fish in pockets without water. Now the War Department has agreed to cooperate in the maintenance of the pool levels during these months. It does not affect navigation in the lower Mississippi River or any other part of the Mississippi because the provisions of this cooperation do not relate during the period of the navigation season.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Where does it say that it applies only during the winter?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It says: "Shall operate and maintain pool levels as though navigation was carried on throughout the year."

Of course, the pool levels are maintained during the navigation season. The bill provides for the maintenance of adequate water in pools during the winter months to stop destruction of fish.

Mr. JUDD. Of course, the gentleman knows what our concern is, that there are certain seasons of the year in dry years when the water is so low over the chain of locks above St. Louis that unless there is some draw-down the navigation cannot be carried on. May I ask the gentleman, have the navigation people on the Mississippi River expressed any objection to this bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The navigation people, headed by one of the gentleman's constituents, Mr. Strong, are strongly in favor of this bill, and have agreed to it.

Mr. JUDD. That is what I want to know.

Mr. MACKINNON. Why did the War Department object to this bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The War Department has agreed to cooperate in maintaining pool levels during the winter months to save fish and other wildlife. Because they agreed to do it, they raised an objection to the passage of the bill and said it was not necessary. This bill simply seals the agreement with the War Department.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. I repeat what I have said to the very able and distinguished gentleman from Minnesota privately on many occasions, that very many people in my district are keenly interested in this legislation, and I urge its immediate enactment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Iowa has been very active for this bill. I might say that a similar bill affecting almost the whole country passed the House by unanimous consent last year and was stricken out in the Senate. This bill has been restricted to the Mississippi River between Rock Island, Illinois, and Minneapolis, where most of the damage was done during the war years as a result of the draining of pools in the wintertime.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is very necessary to preserve a proper balance between the conflicting interests

involved. We should give each his due but not permit either to operate to the destruction of the other. The divergent interests are the two groups, one concerned with the preservation of our wildlife, and the other concerned with navigation on the river. I am pleased to hear my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] say that these groups have compromised their differences and agreed on this bill. In view of the gentleman's statement that this does not operate during the navigational season, I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I can assure my colleague from Minnesota that there is no conflict of interest so far as this legislation is concerned, as it simply provides for cooperation on the part of the War Department in the conservation of fish in the upper Mississippi River. The War Department has agreed to cooperate in accordance with the provisions of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act of March 10, 1934 (48 Stat. 401), as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732, 79th Cong.), is hereby amended to include the following new section:

"Sec. 5A. In the management of existing facilities (including locks, dams, and pools) in the Mississippi River between Rock Island, Ill., and Minneapolis, Minn., administered by the United States Corps of Engineers of the War Department, that Department is hereby directed to give full consideration and recognition to the needs of fish and other wildlife resources and their habitat dependent on such waters, without increasing additional liability to the Government, and shall operate and maintain pool levels as though navigation was carried on throughout the year."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUPPLYING UTILITIES TO PERSONS NEAR ARMED ACTIVITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3055) to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, or their designees within their respective establishments, are authorized to sell, under such regulations and at such prices as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, to welfare activities and private persons in the immediate vicinity of naval activities such utilities and related services as are not otherwise available from local, private, or public sources.

Sec. 2. The utilities and related services authorized to be sold under this Act are (1) electric power, (2) steam, (3) compressed air, (4) water, (5) sewage and garbage disposal service, (6) gas (natural, manufactured, or mixed), (7) ice, and (8) mechanical refrigeration: *Provided*, That any

utility or related service provided and sold under the authority of this Act shall not be so provided unless it is determined by the Secretary concerned that the utility or related service is not available from a private or other public source, and that the furnishing thereof is in the public interest.

Sec. 3. As may be required by the local needs, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, in carrying out the purposes of this act, are authorized to effect minor expansions and extensions of the necessary distributing systems or facilities within the naval or military activity for those activities which it is determined may supply local services and utilities as described by section 2 herein.

Sec. 4. The act of June 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 383, 34 U. S. C. 553), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, before "activities" insert "or military."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RETURN OF REMAINS OF THOSE BURIED IN FOREIGN LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3394) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act of May 16, 1946, entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States" (Public Law 383, 79th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Congress hereby declares it to be in the public interest to provide for the interment of the remains of certain persons who died on or after September 3, 1939, and whose remains are buried in places located outside the continental limits of the United States and could not be returned to their homeland for burial due to wartime shipping restrictions, by authorizing their permanent interment outside the continental limits of the United States or their evacuation and return either to their homeland or to the homeland of their next of kin, and to centralize in one agency the task of accomplishing the purpose of this act.

"Sec. 2. All activities herein provided for are hereby made a responsibility of the Secretary of War.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed upon application by the next of kin in the case of individual identified remains to return such remains to the homeland of the decedent or of his next of kin for interment at places designated by the next of kin, including national cemeteries provided such remains are entitled to interment therein; and he is fur-

ther authorized at his own discretion in the case of group of mass burials, which include the remains of one or more known individuals, to cause them to be interred in such places as he may direct: *Provided*, That this act shall apply only to the remains of persons who died on or after September 3, 1939, and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States, and who were—

"(a) members of the armed forces of the United States and who died in the service;

"(b) civilian officers and employees of the United States;

"(c) citizens of the United States who served in the armed forces of any government at war with Germany, Italy, or Japan and who died while in such service and who were citizens of the United States at the time of such service;

"(d) citizens of the United States whose homes are in fact in the United States and whose death outside the continental limits thereof can be directly attributed to the war or who died while employed or otherwise engaged in activities contributing to the prosecution of the war; and

"(e) such other citizens of the United States, the disposition of the remains of whom under the provisions of this act would, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, serve in the public interest.

"Sec. 4. With respect to the remains of all persons who are included in the categories set forth in the preceding section of this act, the Secretary of War is further authorized and directed upon application by the next of kin in the case of individual identified remains, and authorized at his own discretion in the case of unidentified remains and in all cases of identified remains which are not returned to the homeland under the provisions of this act to inter the remains in United States military cemeteries established outside the continental limits of the United States.

"Sec. 5. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase, gift, or devise, without submission to the Attorney General of the United States under the provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 520; 40 U. S. C. 255), land or interest in land in foreign countries necessary for the purposes of this act, and to establish thereon United States military cemeteries. Cemeteries established by the Secretary of War under the authority of this act are subject to the provisions of section 12, Public Law 456, Seventy-ninth Congress.

"Sec. 6. The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

"Sec. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, said sums to be made available for civil functions administered by the War Department, 'Cemeterial expenses, War Department,' to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War.

"Sec. 8. This act and the authority granted therein and all rules and regulations promulgated thereunder shall terminate on December 31, 1951, or upon such earlier date as may be specified in a proclamation by the President, or in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress as the date beyond which further continuance of the authority granted by this act is not necessary in the public interest, whichever date is earliest: *Provided*, That as to any applications provided for under sections 3 and 4 filed prior to such termination date, the provisions of this act and such rules or regulations promulgated pursuant thereto shall be treated as remaining in force for the purpose of providing for the return or overseas burial of remains in the proper cases."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.



TRANSFERRING VESSEL "JOSEPH CONRAD"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3333) to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., for museum purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Maritime Commission is authorized to give and deliver to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., the *Joseph Conrad* for use by the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., as a museum to be in large part devoted to creating interest in the merchant marine and maritime matters. The transfer of said ship to carry a provision that in the event the Maritime Commission should need the ship for training purposes, then it shall be transferred to the Maritime Commission. The Maritime Commission is also authorized to place in the museum pictures, relics, flags, displays, and documents, for the purpose of creating interest in the American merchant marine and maritime matters.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after "deliver" insert "(at her present location, St. Petersburg, Fla.)."

Line 7, after "museum" insert "and for youth-training purposes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON: Page 2, at the end of line 7 insert the following: "In the event the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., should fail to accept under this act, the Maritime Commission is authorized to deliver the said ship to the city of St. Petersburg, Fla., for museum and youth-training purposes."

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment contemplates that in the event that for any reason the Historical Association at Mystic, Conn., could not take the vessel up there and should decline the authorization contained in this bill, the city of St. Petersburg would like to have the opportunity to have it turned over to the city.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, before which this bill was heard, considers this amendment as advisable and meritorious. The committee recommends that it be accepted by the House and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PETERSON. I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this amendment should carry because the city of St. Petersburg has had the opportunity already to accept the ship and has turned it down. There are a number of other historical bodies, some in my own district, that are interested in this ship. I do not think this matter ought to be passed over so lightly.

Mr. PETERSON. The only reason we are putting this amendment in the bill

is that, as stated, originally we had contemplated and would have liked to have it in St. Petersburg. The ship is located there now.

Then the question of raising that thirty-five or forty thousand dollars came. It is now contemplated that the *Conrad* may not be seaworthy, so that it could not be taken somewhere else, and in that event, that it could not be taken to Mystic, they could take it elsewhere.

Mr. POTTS. I think it should be ironed out in some way later on when the whole situation should be considered.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the consideration of the disposition of this ship the city of St. Petersburg asked for the custody of the *Joseph Conrad* as a historical memento or for a museum. Finding that the cost would be considerable, the city of St. Petersburg withdrew its request. Shortly thereafter the Marine Historical Association, of Mystic, Conn., made request for the ship, and the committee gave it full consideration. There have been several requests from organizations, some in the vicinity of New York, and in each case the organization has been asked to appear before the committee and make a presentation of its desires. In every case, such organization has failed to appear and has made no effort whatsoever to present its case.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, in this particular instance this constituent of mine asked me to see if this ship could not be obtained for the Bluejackets Patriotic Organization, and the reason nothing was done on it, although my suggestion was transmitted to the authorities, was that there was a bill pending in the Congress and, therefore, their request could not be considered until this bill was disposed of. But I do not think they ought to be turned down so abruptly. They ought to have a chance to put in a bid for the ship.

Mr. BRADLEY. In several instances I informed the inquirers from the gentleman's district that the ship was available and of what the probable cost would be to make the ship seaworthy. In no case did they see fit to follow up on their inquiries. Even at the present time it appears that the cost of moving this ship may be so great that the museum of Mystic, Conn., will not accept it, and that is the reason that the city of St. Petersburg has requested that this bill be amended as now proposed. I think the amendment should be accepted. We have fooled around with this thing for the past 4 months and I hope that we can get somewhere with it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. If the Mystic, Conn., people should not accept the ship, what harm is done by voting down the amendment and allowing the New York people or any other people to have their say at some time in the future?

Mr. BRADLEY. May I say to the gentleman that the Maritime Commission

has had this ship available for disposal for a long time. It is alongside a dock at St. Petersburg, Fla., and is costing the Government money to keep it up every single day it is there. It is about time that we got rid of it and got it off our expense account. We have given various groups 3 or 4 months to present their cases in order to get this ship off our hands, and no one has appeared to actually ask for it except these two organizations.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Will not this ship be declared surplus property on June 30 if it is not taken now?

Mr. BRADLEY. This ship will be declared surplus at any time that we can find somebody to take care of it. Nobody wants to buy it. It cost the Government \$1; nobody really wants it now except as a souvenir. It will cost close to \$40,000 to put it in condition to be used as a training ship of any kind, and I do not know of any private organization which is going to be willing to spend that much money on it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., for museum and youth-training purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION RULES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2293) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters," approved February 8, 1895.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That subdivision (a) of rule 3 in the first section of the act entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters," approved February 8, 1895, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 33, sec. 252 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) On or in front of the foremast, or if a vessel without a foremast, then in the fore part of the vessel, a bright white light so constructed as to show an unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of 20 points of the compass, so fixed as to throw the light 10 points on each side of the vessel, namely, from right ahead to 2 points abaft the beam on either side, and of such a character as to be visible at a distance of at least 5 miles. Such light shall be at a greater height above the water than the side lights required by subdivisions (b) and (c)."

Sec. 2. Subdivision (e) of rule 3 in the first section of such act (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 33, sec. 252 (e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) A steamer of over 100 feet register length shall carry also, when under way, a bright white light so fixed as to throw the light all around the horizon, and of such a character as to be visible at a distance of at least 3 miles. Such light shall be placed in line with the keel at least 15 feet higher

than, and more than 50 feet abaft, the light mentioned in subdivision (a); or in lieu thereof two such lights of the same character and height as herein described placed not over 30 inches apart horizontally, one on either side of the keel, and so arranged that one or the other or both shall be visible from any angle of approach."

SEC. 3. Rule 3 of such act (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 33, sec. 252) is amended by adding the following:

"(f) A steam vessel not more than 100 feet in length shall carry also a bright white light aft to show all around the horizon. Such light shall be placed in line with the keel higher than the light required by subdivision (a)."

SEC. 4. Subdivision (e) of rule 14 in the first section of such act (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 33, sec. 271 (e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) A vessel at anchor and a vessel aground in or near a channel or fairway shall at intervals of not more than 2 minutes ring the bell rapidly for from 3 to 5 seconds and, in addition, at intervals of not more than 3 minutes shall sound on the whistle or horn a signal of one short blast, two long blasts, and one short blast in quick succession."

SEC. 5. The first section of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"RULE 30. (a) Between sunrise and sunset every vessel over 65 feet in length when at anchor shall carry forward, where it can best be seen, one black ball not less than 2 feet in diameter.

"(b) A vessel over 65 feet in length which is not under command shall carry where they can best be seen and, if a steam vessel, in lieu of the white light required by rule 3 (a), two red lights in a vertical line one over the other not less than 3 feet apart, and of such a character as to be visible all around the horizon at a distance of at least 2 miles. By day such vessel shall carry in a vertical line one over the other not less than 3 feet apart, where they can best be seen, two black balls, each 2 feet in diameter. Such vessel, when not making way through the water, shall not carry the side lights required by rule 3 (b) and (c), but when making way shall carry them.

"(c) A vessel aground over 65 feet in length shall carry by night the white light or lights prescribed for a vessel at anchor and in addition shall carry, where they can best be seen by approaching vessels, two red lights in a vertical line one over the other, not less than 3 feet apart, visible all around the horizon at a distance of at least 2 miles. By day such vessel shall carry in a vertical line one over the other not less than 3 feet apart, where they can best be seen, three black balls, each 2 feet in diameter."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDING SECTION 107 OF TITLE 2 OF THE CANAL ZONE CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1260) to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the report does not indicate the cost of this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING NAVIGATION RULES FOR THE WESTERN RIVERS AND INLAND WATERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3350) relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather long and involved bill and requires explanation more extended than can be given to it on the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### ESTABLISHING A FISH HATCHERY AT ROGERS CITY, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 210) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Rogers City, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is with hesitancy that I question the consideration of the next three bills on the calendar, due to the fact that they are close to and dear to the heart of the former chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, who is held in high regard not only by the members of the committee but by the membership of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that these four bills authorize the establishment of rearing ponds, fish hatcheries, and laboratories that are not in existence. In calling attention to the establishment of these fish hatcheries and laboratories, I refer to the recent appropriation bill which so drastically curtailed the appropriation for the Fish and Wild Life Service in the Department of the Interior that it practically caused the closing of one of the finest laboratories and fish hatcheries on the Atlantic coast at Beaufort, N. C.

The following facts will support this hatchery:

Congress in 1900, during the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt, authorized the construction of this biological station which was completed and opened to investigators for the first time in 1902.

It is located in the center of the greatest fish- and shellfish-producing country

in the United States where over 150,000,000 pounds are caught annually and ideal conditions exist for studies of an unusually large variety of marine plants and animals, many of which are of great economic importance in the Atlantic and Gulf coastal fishery resources.

Facilities have been provided here for conducting marine scientific research and practical experiments by hundreds of scientists from universities, military agencies, State and Federal institutions, and private concerns, the majority of which have contributed exceedingly valuable information for the conservation and development of our fishery resources, national health, and for protection of the United States Navy, at virtually no expense to the Beaufort laboratory.

It served as a naval radio station during World War I, and since 1938 conducted special marine investigations concerning fouling of ships' bottoms, prevention of corrosion and marine growth on flying ships, studies of submarine sounds, examination of sunken U-boats, cooperation in Naval Intelligence, and other problems of World War II. The Civil Air Patrol was also provided with quarters in 12 of the laboratory rooms during its valuable wartime functions in this region.

The Beaufort laboratory is also the world's greatest hatchery for the diamond-back terrapin, and has produced over 240,000 eggs and young of this valuable species for restocking of coastal waters, and for biological and medical research. The annual crop now being produced there has a value of over \$5,000.

Since 1931 the present director of the laboratory has arranged for over 275 scientific studies and experiments to be conducted here at virtually no expense to the Federal Government by outside investigators which have yielded biological and technological information of vital importance to the health and safety of the Nation that is worth many times the cost of operating this field station.

In addition to the 15 regular oyster investigations conducted here in the 10 years prior to World War II, the laboratory rendered emergency service on 24 special problems in the States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Louisiana involving damage to the oyster resources and other fisheries by hurricanes, pollution, natural enemies, new waterways, and unusual climatological conditions. The expense of these was taken care of by special arrangements with State conservation departments and commercial fishery interests.

In 1941 the first and only experimental oyster farm in this country was designed and constructed by the Beaufort Laboratory with funds provided by the State of North Carolina. The State has just appropriated \$5,000 for research operations at the North River oyster farm and \$100,000 for rehabilitation of its oyster resources in accordance with its special cooperating agreement with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Also for shrimp investigations \$50,000 has been appropriated. All the Federal



Government has provided for these projects is advisory plans, programs, and supervision of research operations.

During the depression the Beaufort Laboratory established and supervised many work-relief projects involving expenditures of over \$1,000,000 for our southern fisheries whereby the seafood resources might be improved in quantity and quality and yield fair returns to our low-income fishermen. Several cooperative freezing, processing, and storage plants were constructed along the coast.

The 11 acres of property adjacent to the Beaufort Laboratory on Piver's Island was donated to Duke University by the director, and a fine marine laboratory erected there in 1938 for education of students in the biological sciences and for fundamental research.

In 1943 the director of the laboratory received a war assignment as Coordinator of Fisheries for the Chesapeake Bay and North Carolina region where continued production of its 550,000,000-pound fish crop was greatly needed in an extremely complicated military area. A high yield was obtained by our commercial fishermen who operated at considerable risk and rendered special service as observers for the Navy's Eastern Sea Frontier. The laboratory also handled most of the war problems of our great menhaden industry, which after contributing half of its best vessels to the United States Navy came through with better than average production from dangerous coastal areas on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, and in 1946 was our No. 1 commercial fishery which converted over 900,000,000 pounds of fish into the fish meal and oil that was greatly needed by the agriculture and many important industries.

I hope that when this bill reaches the other body they will restore certain amounts of this fund so as to permit established institutions to continue to serve the purpose for which they have been created. They truly have been rendering a great service to the Fish and Wildlife Service, particularly in the matter of the production of more edible fish and seafood for the people of this country. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has already made that request.

The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### FISH HATCHERY AT ST. IGNACE, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 214) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near St. Ignace, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I have said before, my reservation applies to four bills—178, 179, 180, and 181. I think we could deal with them all at the present time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

#### FISH HATCHERY AT CHARLEVOIX, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 215) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Charlevoix, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

#### FISH HATCHERY ON THE ANNA RIVER, ALGER COUNTY, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 216) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I desire recognition to make a statement regarding these bills.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can do it under a reservation of objection if he so desires.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is nothing I can do, of course, regarding the passing over of these bills, but I do want the House and the country to know that within my service in this body every Federal fish hatchery in Michigan, a State located in the very midst of the Great Lakes fishing area, was taken out of the State with the exception of one, a battle had to be waged to save even one Federal fish hatchery in a State that has more coast line than any other State in the Union, a State prominent in the Great Lakes area and the great fresh water seas of this country. It does seem to me in view of the importance of Michigan in this area the State is entitled to more than one fish hatchery. I would assume that the author of these bills had in mind to reestablish at least one of the Federal fish hatcheries in the State.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, as I stated in my previous remarks, I am very reluctant to object to the authorization contained in these four bills, because I am in hearty accord with the development of the fish and wildlife resources of this country, and I know that this is the way to do it but on account of the conditions I have pointed out, the meager amount of money that was authorized in the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior, I see no reason why we should authorize the establishment of new hatcheries when we simply do not have enough money to operate the hatcheries which have proven their success and the worthiness of their existence. Unless, Mr. Speaker, the bills are passed over without prejudice, I will object to their present consideration.

Mr. DONDERO. I cannot quarrel with the gentleman from North Carolina on the question of trying to economize in the expenses of government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### KENDUSKEAG STREAM, PENOBSCOT COUNTY, MAINE, DECLARED NONNAVIGABLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 599) declaring Kenduskeag Stream, Penobscot County, Maine, to be a nonnavigable waterway.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Kenduskeag Stream, a minor tributary of the Penobscot River, located in Penobscot County, in the State of Maine, be, and the same is hereby, declared to be a nonnavigable waterway within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States of America.

SEC. 2. That the right of Congress to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

#### TRANSFERRING REMOUNT SERVICE FROM THE WAR DEPARTMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3484) to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in the interests of economy and efficiency; the records, property, real and personal, and civilian personnel of the Remount Service of the Quartermaster Corps, War Department, are hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture, effective July 1, 1947. Prior to that date, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture shall enter into a written agreement on the property and the personnel covered by this transfer.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to receive the property transferred by this act and is directed to administer it in such manner as he deems will best advance the livestock and agricultural interests of the United States, including improvement in the breeding of horses suited to the needs of the United States; the acquisition by purchase in the open market, exchange, hire, or donation of breeding stock; and necessary land, buildings, and facilities; the use of horses in the improvement of the supply of horses available in agriculture; the demonstration of the quality and usefulness of horses through participation in and lending for use in fairs, shows, and other events, or otherwise; the loan, sale, or hire of animals or animal products through such arrangements and subject to such fees as are deemed necessary by the Secretary to accomplish the purposes of this act, and, in carrying out such program, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with public and private organizations and individuals under such rules and regulations as are deemed by him to be necessary.

SEC. 3. Until June 30, 1948, the Secretary of War may detail to the Department of Agriculture such military personnel, including officers in the Veterinary Corps of the Medical Department, as he may determine with the Secretary of Agriculture, to be desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act or to safeguard the interest of the United States. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in existing law, retired officer personnel of the War Department, if employed by the Department of Agriculture for the purposes of this

act only, may receive in addition to their retired pay, civilian salary to the extent that the total from both sources does not exceed the pay and allowances received by such persons in the permanent grade last held by them prior to retirement.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture such funds as may be necessary to carry out this act. The authority of the War Department to conduct a remount breeding program is hereby abolished. Funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall be available for necessary administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, and purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "stock;" and insert "stock."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 3484, represents an agreement between the Department of War and the Department of Agriculture on the best way to handle the Remount Service in the light of the decision of the War Department to terminate the program as far as the military budget is concerned. This decision was taken following the elimination of horse cavalry from the Army.

To those who have taken pride in the program as it has been conducted by the War Department, may I say that I did not introduce a bill to handle this matter until the Secretary of War stated to me in a letter dated March 25, 1947, that "steps had been taken to terminate the program" and that he saw "no other alternative" in view of the fact that an effort to transfer the service of the Agriculture Department by agreement between the secretaries had been ruled by the Attorney General to be beyond the powers of the President under either the First War Powers Act or the Reorganization Act.

Thereupon I wrote and introduced the bill H. R. 2868 which was discussed informally with representatives of both the War and Agriculture Departments and officials of the American Remount Association and many Members of Congress. The bill now before us, H. R. 3484, is a revised version of the first bill, drafted in conformity with suggestions of the two Departments, and, as far as I know, represents complete agreement by all concerned.

Both Departments recommend enactment of this bill, and it is before the House with the endorsement of the Committee on Agriculture as well as the Committee on Armed Services. Their statements appear in the report on the bill.

It will be noted that the bill calls for a written agreement between the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture on the property and personnel covered by the transfer prior to July 1, 1947.

Members of the Committee on Agriculture have said to me that they desire to have a clear-cut understanding with the Department upon the program that will be followed in the administration of the Remount Service. That certainly should be provided, and I urge that the Department take immediate steps to confer with the committee prior to the drawing of the agreement with the Secretary of War.

To the many members who have collaborated in this matter, I express the appreciation of the many people throughout the country who are interested in the continuation of the Remount Service for the improvement of the light horse industry.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ORGANIC ACT OF THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3106) to reenact and amend the Organic Act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redefining their geographic scope.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### CENSUS ROLL OF THE INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2878) to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the census roll of the Indians of California provided for therein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act of May 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended by the act of April 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 259), be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows:

That section 1 of the act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), be amended to read as follows: "Section 1. That for the purposes of this act, the Indians of California shall be defined to be all Indians who were residing in the State of California on June 1, 1852, and their descendants now living."

SEC. 2. That section 7 of the act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. That the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, is hereby authorized and directed to revise the census roll of the Indians of California, made by him in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, by removing from said roll the names of persons who have died since May 18, 1928, and by adding the names of children, and their descendants, now living, born since May 18, 1928, to enrollees whose names are on said roll, and by adding to said census roll the names of Indians not now on said roll and who come within the definition provided for in section 1 of this act. The Indians of California in each community may elect a committee of three enrollees who may aid the enrolling agent in any matters relating to the revision of said roll. Any person claiming to be entitled to enrollment may, within 1 year after the approval of this act, make an application in writing to the Secretary of the Interior for enrollment. After the expiration of such period of time, the Secretary of the Interior shall have 6 months to approve and promulgate such revised roll, after which the roll shall be closed and thereafter no additional names shall be added thereto: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare and distribute to the Indians of California not less than three thousand

copies of an alphabetical printed list, consisting of the name of each Indian on the census roll approved May 17, 1933, giving name, address, age at time of enrollment, and such other factual information, if any, as the Secretary may deem advisable as tending to identify each enrollee."

With the following committee amendments:

On line 3, page 1, the phrase "Section 7 of" should be inserted immediately following the word "That."

Lines 6, 7, 8, and 9 of page 1 should be deleted.

Lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 of page 2 should be deleted.

On line 7 of page 2, the word "census" should be deleted.

On line 13 of page 2, the phrase "qualified under section 1 of the act of May 18, 1928," should be inserted following the word "enrollees."

On line 13 of page 2, the comma and the phrase "and by" should be deleted and a period substituted therefor.

On line 13 of page 2, the word "are" should be deleted and the word "appear" substituted therefor.

Lines 14 and 15 on page 2 should be deleted.

On line 16 of page 2, the words "section 1 of this act," should be deleted.

On line 20 of page 2, the words "as herein amended," should be inserted following the word "act."

On line 23 of page 2, the words "six months" should be deleted and the words "one year" substituted therefor.

On line 4 of page 3, the word "census" should be deleted.

On line 8 of page 3, the quotation mark ("") appearing thereon should be deleted.

Beginning with line 9 of page 3, the following paragraph should be added:

"Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, the sum of \$25,000 to remain available until expended, to be used to defray the expenses incurred by the Secretary of the Interior in revising the roll, as provided herein."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROMOTING THE MINING OF COAL, PHOSPHATE, SODIUM, POTASSIUM, OIL, OIL SHALE, GAS, AND SULFUR ON LAND ACQUIRED BY THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3022) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice in order that the membership of the House may be given a greater opportunity to study the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and for the information of the House, the purpose of this



bill is to promote and encourage the development of the ore, gas, and other minerals on the acquired lands of the United States on a uniform basis under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. In the interest of economy, it eliminates several agencies now engaged in the leasing of acquired lands for oil, and gas, and centralizes this function in the Department of the Interior.

The report on this bill has been carefully considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands of the House, it has been carefully considered by the full committee and unanimously reported by the subcommittee and also by the full committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### HELIUM-BEARING GAS LANDS IN THE NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION, N. MEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3372) authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I take this time so that I may explain an amendment which will be offered on behalf of the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which I am a member.

The purpose of this bill is to ratify certain agreements entered into between the Government, through the Interior Department, and Continental Oil Co. and the Santa Fe Corp., on the one hand, and between the Government and the Navajo Indian Tribe in New Mexico, on the other, so that the Government may obtain, develop, and conserve valuable helium deposits in the Navajo country, all of which are described in House Document No. 212, Eightieth Congress.

The bill has to be passed by the end of this month, because the agreement between the Government and the oil companies, which has taken over 4 years of investigation and negotiation, would become null and void unless this bill became law by the end of this fiscal year.

It seemed to the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs and also to the Public Lands Committee that the objectives related in House Document No. 212 are sound in seeking to separate the production of helium from the production of oil and other gases so that the Government could hold in reserve the largest deposit of helium now known in the world today.

However, the proposed contracts with the Navajo Indians, the Continental Oil Co., and the Santa Fe Corporation, are highly complex. The Navajo Tribe is to receive a cash consideration of \$147,799. The Government has a total plant investment of nearly \$4,000,000—inclusive of the second helium well—and yet it is to pay the Navajos for this remarkable helium deposit the sum of \$147,799.

The oil companies involved, having expert legal and other advice, are quite able to conduct their own transactions and no special equities apply to them,

but all valuation factors for the Indians have been determined by the Geological Survey in conjunction with the Bureau of Mines. All the advice which the Indians received has been from the Indian Bureau or from representatives of these two agencies of the Government pursuant to which the tribal council approved the helium transaction.

There is not the slightest doubt in the minds of committee members, I am sure, but that these determinations of value were all honestly arrived at on the part of the Government agents, and yet the fact remains that the Government as guardian of the Indians is buying out the interests of its own wards and dependents in one of the greatest natural resources the Navajos possess. The nature of the Government's obligation requires that the highest degree of care be utilized to see that we deal fairly and equitably with the Navajo Indians. The questions of valuation are highly complex. A few of these questions are as follows:

First. In reducing the anticipated future payments to the Navajos to present worth in order to pay the entire consideration now, is it fair to apply a discount rate of 4 percent? There is no better security than a commitment from the Government. Long-term Government bonds pay only 2½ percent interest. If a 2 percent discount rate is used in this case, the income to the Navajos would be greater by about \$30,000.

Second. If a familiar equation of determining capital value is used, whereby income is anticipated as it is here, and deductions are made for operating expenses and risk, and the net return is capitalized at an appropriate rate, the consideration payable to the Indians would be very much greater even without questioning the price paid for the gas or the royalty rate. What is the correct method of valuation which should be applied to this case?

Third. This is not just a case of determining just compensation. There are clearly equitable factors here which should be considered. When the Government is dealing with its own wards, and perhaps as a matter of legal rights on the merits quite outside of that relationship. For example, when helium was discovered, as reported in House Document No. 212, on July 1, 1942, it was considered "a find." The Indians had not leased their lands for helium production. They had leased them for oil and gas production in both the 1923 and 1942 leases. Is it possible that the former arrangements by contract should have been revised in the light of this new discovery and the subject treated anew? Certainly the production of helium gas was a separate and distinct business enterprise undertaken by separate and distinct parties requiring a \$3,600,000 plant of its own.

Should the discovery of helium have required a new rental arrangement in respect to the lands?

Is a price of 12 cents a thousand cubic feet adequate for gas having 7.63 percent of helium—the highest helium content yet discovered and in the greatest helium deposit known in the world?

Fourth. We should also be quite sure in dealing with the Indians that the roy-

alty is adequate. Is one-eighth royalty enough for a proven field? It is, I believe, a generally accepted royalty for unproven fields, but this was a proven field after July 1, 1942. For example, in the Rio Vista gas field, the Amerada Oil Co. and Standard Oil Co. of California, pay the Government over 50 percent in royalties on production from Government lands. Royalties in proven gas fields run as high as 60 percent. What should be the royalty in this unique case?

I do not know and I do not think that members of the committee know what the answers to these questions should be, but it is quite clear that these and any other questions which study will reveal, should not be unilaterally answered against the Indians without independent legal or other advice if they desire to have it, and I think they should have such advice. They should have the opportunity to assert any claims for additional compensation which they consider appropriate after receiving such advice, and if such claims are not recognized and paid then to have them adjudicated in the Court of Claims.

I have, therefore, submitted, and the Indian Affairs Subcommittee has approved an amendment to be added at the end of the first paragraph of this bill which will permit the Indians to assert such a claim and to go into court within 3 years after the effective date of the act, this being considered as an adequate time in which to secure expert assistance on this problem and to assert any additional claim that they may have for adequate compensation. The Department of the Interior has approved the amendment, and an identical amendment was adopted this morning by the Public Lands Committee of the Senate on consideration of the companion bill pending in that body.

There is every reason for the greatest possible precaution in seeing that the assets of the Navajos which remain to them today are conserved and developed for the maximum benefit of the tribe. This is particularly true in view of the well-known plight of the Navajos whose grazing resources have been so sharply curtailed as to virtually destroy the native economy of the tribe, curtailing their income and resulting in deplorable living conditions among the Navajos.

In view of the time limitations in the agreements—June 30, 1947—it is deemed impractical for Congress to go further into the details of these transactions but instead to provide a forum in which the Indians may advance any claims in respect to these matters which on independent advice they consider proper.

As a matter of fact, since the Government in this transaction necessarily is dealing with itself as guardian for the Indians, the transaction reduced to its simplest elements is, irrespective of the fairness and care of the officials involved, a taking equivalent to the taking of property by eminent domain, and it is well established that in such cases a judicial determination of the fairness and adequacy of the consideration after the taking is always in order.

To have attempted a thorough determination of the adequacy of the consid-

eration here would have taken weeks of testimony. We reported the bill out, and I supported it only on the assurance that the Indians could submit the matter to the Court of Claims under section 26 of the Indian Claims Commission bill. Thereafter a careful study of that bill convinced us that that act was not broad enough, and it is for this reason that I presented this amendment to the Indian Affairs Committee for consideration and obtained the approval of the Interior.

With this statement, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of the right to object, with the hope that there will be no objection to the amendment, as there could not be any, I am sure, if the matter is understood by all. It is the only fair thing we can do for the Indians under the circumstances.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman has made a good statement explaining the matter. I hope the amendment he offers will be adopted. It is simply a precaution safeguarding the Navajo Indians so that we may see to it that the wards of the Government are justly treated by the Government in case there should be any necessary adjustment to be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, and the Navajo Tribe of Indians are authorized to enter into an agreement dated December 1, 1945, entitled "An agreement severing certain formations from oil and gas leases and substituting new leases as to those formations" and an amending agreement, affecting lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., copies of which are published in House of Representatives Document No. 212, Eightieth Congress, first session; and said agreements are ratified and approved.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to enter into an agreement dated September 19, 1946, with Continental Oil Co. and Santa Fe Corp. entitled "Agreement for assignments of interests in oil and gas leases and for operations on the leaseholds," and two agreements supplemental thereto, affecting lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., copies of which are published in House of Representatives Document No. 212, Eightieth Congress, first session; and said agreements are ratified and approved.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: After the period at the end of section 1, insert the following: "If said Navajo Tribe of Indians shall, after investigation, deem the total consideration payable to it by the United States pursuant to such agreement dated December 1, 1945, as amended, to be in any respect less than reasonable, fair, just, and equitable, said tribe shall be entitled within 3 years after the date of enactment of this act to institute suit against the United States in the Court of Claims for the recovery of such additional sum as may be necessary to compensate said tribe for the reasonable, fair, just, and equitable value of all right, interest, and property passing from said tribe to the United States under such agreement, as amended. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine any suit so instituted and to enter final judgment against the United States therein for such sum, if any,

in excess of the total consideration payable pursuant to such agreement, as amended, as such court may determine to be necessary to provide consideration in all respects reasonable, fair, just, and equitable. Appellate review of any judgment so entered shall be in the same manner, and subject to the same limitations, as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended (28 U. S. C., sec. 250). Notwithstanding any contract to the contrary, not more than 10 percent of the amount received or recovered by said tribe in satisfaction of any claim asserted under this section shall be paid to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF TITLE I OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1230) to amend sections 2 (a) and 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out in the first sentence the following: "and prior to July 1, 1947."

Sec. 2. Section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out of the second proviso "June 30, 1947" in each place where it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1948."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out section 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "sentence", strike out the following: "and prior to July 1, 1947" and insert "1947" and inserting "1949."

The bill will then read:

"That section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out in the first sentence '1947' and inserting '1949.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the title of the bill just passed (S. 1230) be amended. I call attention to the fact that the title presently carried in the bill contains surplus language, inasmuch as the committee struck section 2 from the original bill. In order that the title may be appropriate, I ask unanimous consent that it be amended to read as follows: "To amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PENSIONS TO SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 969) to provide increases in the rates of pensions

payable to Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be stricken from the Consent Calendar. We have reported out of our committee a bill, the O'Konski bill, H. R. 3516, that takes in a few additional veterans. Our committee has been promised a hearing before the Committee on Rules in a few days on that bill, which takes in another group of veterans, the remaining Civil War veterans, of whom there are only 93 left, and some of their dependents. I realize it will not go through on this calendar anyway. I am sure the rule on our bill will be reported unanimously by that committee and will pass the House unanimously.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the situation set forth by the gentleman from Massachusetts, another bill has been reported out of her committee or is about to be reported out.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It has been reported out. It includes the few remaining Civil War veterans.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does that bill also include the group covered in this bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It has the same provisions for the Spanish-American War veterans and includes this other very small and pathetic group. They are dying at the rate of 5 or 6 a month. There are only 93 alive today. The Civil War veterans are not organized and have no one to fight for them. The Spanish-American War veterans were glad to help them and have them included in their bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is satisfied a rule will be granted?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I feel satisfied a rule will be granted. Of course, no one is ever sure of anything today, but the chairman of the committee has promised a hearing, and I do not know a single person on the Rules Committee or on the floor of Congress who will object to the passage of the bill or will vote against it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is true there is nothing certain in life, and that might be particularly true in relation to the rule. That is the reason I ask if that was the gentleman's own personal assurance or whether she had assurance from other directions.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have had indications, I will say to the gentleman, from other directions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Indications in this body are very weak evidence to me. I withdraw my reservation of objection, but I hope that the gentleman's confidence will be confirmed by a rule being reported by the Rules Committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would be greatly surprised if the O'Konski rule were not granted and if the bill did not pass the House and the Senate unanimously. The bill was passed unanimously out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and is a better bill than the one on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure none of us would want to have the gentleman from Massachusetts, whom we all like,



be mistaken. I hope her leadership will keep that in mind.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I hope my leadership will keep that in mind also.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is what I said.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the bill which the gentlewoman mentions that is before the Rules Committee the same as this with respect to the groups covered?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; and it includes a few more veterans.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is well; but I think this bill ought to remain a while longer on the calendar.

Mr. CARROLL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does not the gentlewoman think her request to strike this bill from the calendar is premature until such time as the Rules Committee does report out a rule on the bill she has in mind?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then I shall ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. CARROLL. I think that would be better.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My original request was to strike this bill from the calendar.

Mr. KEAN. We have no objection to the first request as yet.

The SPEAKER. What is the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be stricken from the calendar. The O'Konski bill includes the provisions of this bill and adds others.

Mr. BROOKS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has the gentlewoman considered the possibility that we might take up this bill and amend it so as to include the other group? That might possibly expedite this legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That might be true; but it would be subject to a point of order. I did not feel that that would be fair to the objectors, in view of their rule that they will not consider bills involving large amounts. I like to have my own committee respected in these matters, so I respect the viewpoint of the objectors. I am positive the bill, H. R. 3516, I have referred to will go through. I believe in doing unto others as I would have them do unto me. I have been assured by the leadership that veterans' legislation will be taken up and passed a little later. I believe veterans' legislation should be considered early, not late, in a session of Congress. Unfortunately, veterans' legislation has always been considered last instead of early in the Congress. However, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Congress already have passed in this session some bills which have become law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CARROLL. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### REGULAR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the first paragraph of section 27 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 627, 628), is hereby further amended as follows:

"Effective July 1, 1947, the Secretary of War is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a of this act, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army from among qualified male persons not less than 17 years of age for periods of 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 years, and to accept reenlistments for periods of 3, 4, 5, or 6 years: *Provided*, That persons of the first three enlisted grades may be reenlisted for unspecified periods of time on a career basis under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided further*, That anyone who serves three or more years of an enlistment for an unspecified period of time may submit to the Secretary of War his resignation and such resignation shall be accepted by the Secretary of War and such person shall be discharged from his enlistment within 3 months of the submission of such resignation. Except if such person, other than an enlisted member of a Regular Army Puerto Rican unit submits his resignation while stationed overseas or after embarking for an overseas station, the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until a total of 2 years of overseas service shall have been completed in the current overseas assignment, and in the case of anyone who has completed any course of instruction pursuant to paragraph 13 of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535), or pursuant to section 2 of the Act of April 3, 1939 (58 Stat. 556), as amended (10 U. S. C. 298a), the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until 2 years subsequent to the completion of such course. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept any such resignation in time of war or national emergency declared by the President or Congress, or while the person concerned is absent without leave or serving a sentence of court martial. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept a resignation for a period not to exceed 6 months following the submission thereof if the enlisted person is under investigation or in default with respect to public property or public funds: *Provided further*, That no person under the age of 18 years shall be enlisted without the written consent of his parents or guardians, and the Secretary of War shall, upon the application of the parents or guardians of any such person enlisted without their written consent, discharge such person from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of such person, after enlistment, shall entitle him: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any right to reenlistment in the Regular Army under any other provision of law. No person who is serving under an enlistment contracted on or after June 1, 1945, shall be entitled, before the expiration of the period of such enlistment, to enlist for an enlistment period which will expire before the expiration of the enlistment period for which he is so serving: *Provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged

from the Regular Army who upon such discharge is recommended for reenlistment, shall be permitted to reenlist with the rank held by him at the time of his discharge if he reenlists within a period to be specified by the Secretary of War but not to exceed 3 months from the date of such discharge: *And provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army by reason of acceptance of his resignation shall not be entitled upon subsequent reenlistment to the rank, rating, or grade held at the time of discharge."

Sec. 2. Any person who enlists or reenlists in the Regular Military Establishment on or after June 1, 1945, in the seventh grade, upon the completion of recruit training, but not later than 4 months subsequent to the date of enlistment, shall, unless sooner promoted, be promoted to the sixth grade, provided he meets such qualifications as may be prescribed in regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowance shall accrue to any person by reason of enactment of this section.

Sec. 3. Section 2 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 4, 602), is further amended by deleting the last sentence thereof.

Sec. 4. Paragraph 4 of section 10 of the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end of such paragraph and by adding immediately after such colon the following: "*Provided further*, That in addition to such enlistment allowance, any person enlisting for an unspecified period of time shall be paid the sum of \$50 upon the completion of each year of service of such reenlistment, and any person who resigns or is discharged from such enlistment for an unspecified period of time shall not thereafter be entitled to any additional enlistment or reenlistment allowance based on any period served in such enlistment for an unspecified period of time."

Sec. 5. effective July 1, 1947, sections 653 and 653a of title 10, United States Code, are repealed and all other laws and parts of laws insofar as they are inconsistent with or in conflict with the provisions of this act are likewise repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 5, add a new section, as follows: "Sec. 6. Sections 57 and 58 of the National Defense Act, as amended, are further amended by striking out the word 'eighteen' therefrom and substituting therefor the word 'seventeen' in each of the said sections."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That is the last bill on the calendar eligible to be called.

#### THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to a bill on the Consent Calendar, Calendar No. 195 (H. R. 3769) to provide that membership in the National Guard shall not disqualify a person from serving as a part-time referee in bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, in making this request, I might state that I have cleared the matter with the majority leader and the minority leader and the objectors on both sides of the aisle. If this bill is passed over for another 2 weeks there would be no purpose in passing the bill. It must become law before the 1st of

July or the purpose of the bill will be defeated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3769) to provide that membership in the National Guard shall not disqualify a person from serving as a part-time referee in bankruptcy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the proviso to clause (2) of section 35 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, is amended by inserting after "notaries public," the following new language: "members of the National Guard of the United States and of the National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia."

With the following committee amendments:

Line 7, after the quotation marks and before the word "members" insert "retired officers and enlisted men of the Regular and Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, members of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard."

Line 9, after the comma insert "except the National Guard disbursing officers who are on a full-time salary basis."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING SECRETARIES FOR CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to a bill on the Consent Calendar, Calendar No. 102, H. R. 2746, to provide secretaries for circuit and district judges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2746) to provide secretaries for circuit and district judges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the reason the bill was passed over a few moments ago was due to the fact that the approximate figures of the cost were not known. Those figures have now been made available. The salaries are approximately \$929,580, and travel expenses approximately \$85,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That each circuit judge and each district judge may appoint a secretary, and each senior circuit judge and each senior district judge in districts having five or more district judges may also appoint an assistant secretary, who shall, subject to appropriations to be made by the Congress, receive compensation to be fixed from time to time by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States courts and shall be reimbursed for their actual traveling expenses and expenses incurred for subsistence, within the limitations prescribed by law, when necessarily absent from their designated posts of duty on official business.

Sec. 2. Within the meaning of this act the District of Columbia shall be deemed to be both a circuit and a district, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia a circuit court of appeals, and the chief justice and associate justices of that court the senior circuit judge and circuit judges thereof, and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia a district court, and the chief justice and associate justices of that court the senior district judge and district judges thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, after the word "each" and before the word "district", insert the word "senior."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

#### MISSING PERSONS ACT

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 3191) to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the sentence under the heading entitled "Transfer of Appropriations," contained in title II of the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946 (Public Law 301, 79th Cong., approved February 18, 1946), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the sentence and inserting the following: "and (3) the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended."

Sec. 2. The Secretary of War is authorized to reconsider claims upon which payment has been denied by reason of section 1 of this act having been omitted from the First Supplemental Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946 (Public Law 301, 79th Cong., approved February 18, 1946).

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] There being no demand for a second, the question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

#### COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 3818) to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 321) to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368; 37 U. S. C. 117), is hereby amended by striking therefrom the figures "\$780" and substituting therefor the figures "\$936."

Sec. 2. The increases in pay provided by this act shall become effective on the first day of the first month following its enactment, and no increase in pay for any period prior thereto shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

The gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill raises for the first time the allowance for cadets and midshipmen at the two Academies. There were objections to consideration of the bill on the Consent Calendar.

I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY], chairman of the subcommittee which handled this bill.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, S. 321, a bill to increase pay for cadets and midshipmen of service academies, is, in my judgment, an especially important one because it concerns those young men now in the service academies who will soon be actively in the armed services of our country.

It comes before the House today with the unanimous approval of Subcommittee No. 10 on Pay and Administration, and with the unanimous approval of the Armed Services Committee. This bill has previously passed the Senate.

In these days, when it has become necessary to reduce the potential strength of the Army and Navy, it is all



the more important that our cadets and midshipmen be thoroughly and efficiently trained in order to take their active place in our armed services.

I desire first to call your attention to the fact that at the present time we have 2,496 cadets at the Military Academy, 3,043 midshipmen at the Naval Academy, 300 additional midshipmen appointed under Public Law 729, Seventy-ninth Congress, and 385 cadets at the Coast Guard Academy—totaling 6,224.

The bill under consideration provides for an increase of pay of these cadets and midshipmen. Under section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, cadets at the Coast Guard and Military Academies and midshipmen at the Naval Academy are entitled to pay at the rate of \$65 per month, or \$780 per annum. The present bill amends section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act and increases the pay to \$78 per month, or \$936 per year; an increase of \$13 per month or \$156 per year.

The law establishing the rate of pay of midshipmen and cadets went into effect on July 11, 1919, and there has been no increase in pay since that time—a period of 28 years—although other members of the Armed Services have received pay increases since that year.

The sharp increases of living costs have created a serious handicap in maintaining the cadets and midshipmen at the respective academies. It is not considered practical to eliminate or curtail the various items and activities which make up the expenses chargeable to cadets and midshipmen, as these activities and items have been customary for many years and their elimination or curtailment would be harmful to the attainment of the ends sought by the academies.

It has been the policy of these academies, since their inception, not to permit cadets and midshipmen to draw on outside resources, except when necessary and then in minor amounts. It has been the Government policy that our boys entering the service academies should be placed on the same par socially and economically; and for that reason, each draws the same amount for living expenses and is not allowed to draw from outside resources, except, as stated above, in a very small amount.

Therefore, it is not deemed advisable to change the time-honored rules of these academies and compel the boys to draw funds from home which would immediately result in inequity for the reason that some of these boys come from wealthy homes and the most of them come from the average American home.

The finest thing we can say about these service academies is that the boys represent the rank and file of the American homes and we do not want to see a group within each service academy entitled to greater financial benefits than other groups there located.

I also want to call your attention to the fact that the pay of cadets and midshipmen is under the completed budgetary control of the superintendents of the three academies and is used to cover the cost of uniforms, books, laundry, personal necessities, shoe repair, barber

shop, tailor shop, cultural development, leave, and entertainment.

Based on the present pay scale, a certain percentage is saved over the period of 4 years so that there will be available, at the time of graduation, enough money to enable the graduates to purchase their initial minimum officers equipment.

Let me call your attention to the fact that when the cadet or midshipman enters the Academy, he is required to deposit \$100. He can voluntarily deposit in addition \$250, or a total of \$350. This amount is for his initial outfit, but it is well to remember that if the cadet or midshipman does not have the \$250 to deposit, the Government does it for him. It is a loan from the Government which, of course, must be paid back to the Government.

Commander Craighill of the Naval Academy testified that only 10 to 15 percent of the midshipmen were able to deposit the \$350 at the beginning; the balance making the required deposit of \$100 only.

I have no desire to tire you with figures, but it is necessary for me to call your attention to the fact that the midshipmen and cadets have certain required expenses, which must be deducted from their monthly salaries. Let us take a midshipman in his plebe year.

His first item of expense is the payment on his initial outfit for which he has deposited himself \$100 or, with the aid of the Government, \$250 more. This monthly payment is \$32.85 or a total of \$394.20 for the year. His second item of expense is for additional uniforms for which \$21.18 is deducted monthly, or \$254.16 for the year. The next item of expense is for books and drawing material which amounts to \$2.39 monthly, or \$28.68 annually. Next is his expense for services—barber shop, cobbler, and the tailor—which costs \$3.50 a month, or \$42 annually. The next item is his laundry which has been steadily increasing but actually is now \$8 monthly, or \$96 annually.

One item of expense that has materially increased is laundry. Formerly, the Academy used prisoners of war as civilian personnel in laundries and in services. With the change to the 40-hour week, and with an increase of 18 cents per hour in pay for 290 civil-service employees, the added expense per week for the laundry is \$2,088.

These necessary items total \$815.04 annually, or \$67.91 a month.

Now I want to discuss for a moment the optional expenses. Take a fourth classman for illustration. He is allowed \$2 cash per month, or \$24 annually. He is allowed \$9 per month credit at the midshipmen's store, or \$108 annually, and from which amount he makes his purchases of toilet articles, cigarettes, and miscellaneous items. Next is his extracurricular expenses of \$5.24 monthly, or \$62.88 annually—this money is for tickets to athletic events, subscription to *Loga* magazine, tickets for entertainment programs, and so forth. Next comes his credit to leave of \$1.73 monthly, or \$20.76 annually. This totals \$215.64.

Therefore the total expenses, both optional and required for the first year, are

\$1,030.68. It is, therefore, apparent that the midshipman will be in debt at the end of his first year.

It is well to remember that a midshipman, during his first year gets only \$2 in cash per month and has a credit of \$9 per month in the midshipmen's store, totaling \$11; in the second year, he receives \$4 in cash with a credit of \$10, totaling \$14; in the third year, he receives \$7 in cash and \$11 in credit, totaling \$18; and during his year of graduation, he receives \$11 in cash and \$12 in credit, totaling \$23.

In addition to his monthly payment, the midshipman is allowed 84 cents a day for food and subsistence.

I desire at this time to call your attention to the fact that the question of increase in pay for cadets and midshipmen, as well as service personnel, was considered by the joint Army-Navy Pay Board in their recommendation to the Seventy-ninth Congress, which recommendation, however, was not included in Public Law 474, Seventy-ninth Congress, which authorized certain increases in the pay of other service personnel. Recently, however, the matter was referred for further study and recommendation to the joint Army-Navy Personnel Board. As the result of which, the War and Navy Departments and the Coast Guard jointly approved the provisions of the bill under consideration.

It is estimated that the enactment of the proposed legislation would result in an additional cost of \$970,944 for the fiscal year 1948 as follows:

2,496 cadets at the Military Academy-----	\$389,376
3,043 midshipmen at the Naval Academy-----	474,708
300 additional midshipmen by Public Law 729, Seventy-ninth Congress-----	46,800
385 cadets at the Coast Guard Academy-----	60,060

It is further estimated that the cost of the proposed legislation for the fiscal year of 1948 would be increased to \$1,392,144 for the fiscal year of 1949 and thereafter, by reason of the fact that an estimated increase of 2,700 midshipmen will be appointed under Public Law 729, Seventy-ninth Congress.

I realize full well that it is imperative on the part of Congress to economize in every way possible without destroying the efficiency of any agency of Government, and I share in that view. However, inasmuch as these 6,200 young men will soon be in the active service of our country, it would be false economy to refuse to grant them their additional \$13 a month which is absolutely necessary if they conform to the present rules and regulations of the three service academies, which have proved so successful in the past.

According to the testimony of Admiral Holloway, the so-called pay of midshipmen is really a means of paying their personal expenses while they are midshipmen and to defray the cost of their original outfit as an officer.

Most of their ordinary running expenses are spent through the midshipmen's store, midshipmen's service facilities, and laundry. Fortunately, these activities were in excellent condition

when prices began to rise, and since then they have been squeezed between the rising cost of materials and pay of employees and the fact that the midshipman's budget has not been increased through additional pay for midshipmen.

Accordingly, the recent pay increase granted civil service employees reflects directly against midshipmen in the same manner as the rising cost of materials. The laundry and midshipmen's store have gone backward financially and the midshipmen service facilities are losing about \$3,000 a quarter. The reserves in these services have carried the load up to date but cannot continue to do so indefinitely. The only solution appears to be an increase in the amount that midshipmen can spend. This must be obtained through the pay increase or from outside sources.

I do not wish the midshipmen and cadets to be dependent upon outside sources. We wish them to come from all types of families, and not only from families who can contribute to their education but from poor families as well, and all to be on the same social and economic level.

In the first year of a cadet's or midshipman's service in the Academy it is apparent, because of the first year's heavy expenses, that the cadet or midshipman will be in debt. In the Naval Academy statistics show a debt of \$215 the first year. In his second year he attains a credit of \$40; in his third year a credit of \$200; and in his fourth year a credit of \$470, which enables him to buy the necessary uniforms and equipment which he needs on graduating and entering service.

I have been asked repeatedly by my colleagues whether or not our cadets and midshipmen remain in service after they have been graduated from the academies at Government expense. Let me reply by stating that the records of the West Point Academy and the Naval Academy show clearly that the cadets and midshipmen, in the main, after graduation remain in service as a life career. Let me illustrate.

In West Point from 1930 to, and including 1939, the percentage of all graduates from West Point who resigned in the first 4 years of their service after graduation amounted to only 3 percent. From 1941 to 1946, the West Point record shows only three men—one of the class of 1940, one of the class of 1942, and one of the class of 1945—resigned voluntarily. The record of the Naval Academy bears out the truth of the above statement, because from 1932 to 1947, a period of 15 years, only 5.7 percent resigned.

Another question which has arisen is with reference to the cost of educating a cadet at West Point or a midshipman at the Naval Academy, and some very exaggerated statements have been made with reference thereto. The average cost for educating a cadet at West Point for 4 years is \$18,958; but you must remember that that includes all overhead.

The average cost of educating a midshipman at the Naval Academy for 4 years, counting overhead, is \$16,000. If you should deduct the overhead, then the

cost for the 4 years' education of a midshipman is \$8,000 or \$2,000 per year.

It is well to remember that education in these academies is practically continuous and different from our colleges and universities where education is confined to 9 or 10 months a year.

In conclusion, let me urge my colleagues to support S. 321 which is so vital to the maintenance of our present service academies. The history of America is replete with the fine services performed, in time of war and in time of peace, by our graduates of these academies.

Every Member of Congress is proud of his appointments to the Naval and Military Academies, and I am sure that none of you have let wealth alone play any part in the appointment of your cadets and midshipmen. If this increase in pay is not made, it is going to place a premium on those boys whose families are able to assist them financially. We want our cadets and midshipmen appointed on their ability, their integrity, and their desire to serve. When they obtain their appointment, we do not want any feeling of social caste to enter into academy life. We want our boys to be appointed from American homes, regardless of financial status.

It will follow of necessity that the graduates of these institutions will become a part of the Army and Navy and will become leaders therein, bringing as they will, the splendid instruction which is imparted to them in the academies, and with a love for the service, they will become invaluable to the maintenance of our Government and its preservation.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the amount which the Government allots to these cadets at the two service academies is intended to take care of the necessary expenses of these young men we appoint from time to time. They come from the families of both rich and poor, without discrimination. When those men go to the academies, they have these necessary costs. Unless we increase the amount which they are entitled to draw as an allowance each month, the time will come when a boy from a poor family will not be able to attend the academy, he will not be able to bear the necessary expenses of the academy, he will not be able to afford to go there. It was with those thoughts in mind that I supported this measure when it was before the Committee on the Armed Services.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. When these boys are appointed to Annapolis and West Point and get 4 years free schooling, does the gentleman think he will have anybody objecting to going there to school?

Mr. BROOKS. I will answer the gentleman in this way, the present bill does not contemplate his needs beyond the 4-year period, but it does try to take care of his immediate needs while he is a student, not a soldier, but a student in the service academy. I may answer the

gentleman further by saying that last year I appointed from my district a young man from a poor family. I have had occasion to examine into the matter and I find that boy is not able to carry on with the amount that we give him at the present time. If we are going to make those service academies rich men's academies, then we can afford to eliminate these allowances, but if we want to put it on a fair basis to the poor and wealthy boy alike, we have to give them enough to go along on.

Mr. RICH. Do any of the boys going to West Point or Annapolis try to earn any money on the side to help defray their expenses?

Mr. BROOKS. I will say to the gentleman that they do not have the time to do anything extra.

Mr. RICH. Do you not have any poor boys from your district that go to college, and who obligate themselves, that earn a great part of their money to pay their college tuition?

Mr. BROOKS. Certainly. I do not yield any more to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Every boy in the United States who tries to get an education has a hard time.

Mr. BROOKS. I will say to the gentleman that it is entirely different in the service academies. All the time that those young men have is allotted during the week, and even on Sunday, and at times they only have about 3 or 4 or 5 hours during the entire week that they can do what they want to. It is not physically possible for them to go out and earn their living on the side, or take a side job. I do not think it would be consonant with the policies of the academies or the intention of Congress to permit them to go out and try to earn a living while they are going through the service academies.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to say here that when you Members of Congress appoint a boy to West Point or Annapolis you give him an opportunity for a 4-year course of the best education that any boy or girl in the United States could possibly receive. He has the opportunity of getting an education that costs the taxpayers of this country at least \$20,000 to \$25,000. Now, I think that that is a pretty good scholarship to give any boy. Would any boy reject such a scholarship? You have in your own district hundreds and hundreds of boys that are out striving to get an education, who obligate themselves for hundreds of dollars a year to help get that education. They work their way through colleges, trying to earn money on the side to pay their college tuition. They are poor boys, the same kind of boys that we appoint to West Point and Annapolis, who get their tuition, board, and expenses free. I do not know of any boy that would object to that. They want to get these appointments; every one of them, no boy turns it down on account of it not being worth a thousand times more than it cost.

What this bill is going to do, it is going to ask you to get the taxpayers to pay



\$970,944 more this year, and next year you are going to ask your taxpayers to raise \$1,392,144. Are you justified in passing a bill like this. I say you are not. I had an army official come to see me and talk about this bill. I objected to this bill several times on the Private Calendar. When the Army officer came up and talked to me about, he gave me a chart, and I am sorry I did not know that this bill was coming up today or I would have been here loaded to give you some data on this bill. A West Pointer or Naval Cadet is only going to be about \$140 out after they get their uniforms to start them in business, after they get a 4-year education by your appointment to the Military Academy, when the United States pays \$20,000 to \$25,000 to educate them; the greatest institution and education in the United States. Then you come in here now and want to spend \$1,392,000 more of the taxpayers' money to pass this legislation. You are going to pass it when you fellows in the House here vote for it, but not with my consent, because I tried to stop this legislation, and I think it is time for you fellows to come in here now and try to stop some of the legislation they are trying to pull over the eyes of the taxpayers of this country. It is about time that we wake up. Be wise and economize.

You talk about vetoing the tax bill here a while ago. President Truman never said a word about economies in Government. I hope he vetoes this bill if it passes. How many of you fellows are talking about economies in Government? We talk about trying to save the taxpayers' money. But no, every dog-gone one of you here votes time after time to spend money. Now, it is time to stop it, and I tell you right now that there is nothing better that you can do than to stop this legislation. There is no need for it. It is not justified, and I cannot find out where anybody in Congress would be satisfied, or could satisfy his own conscience under present-day conditions who would vote for legislation of this kind. It just does not make sense. You might say you are going to help some poor boys that go to West Point and Annapolis, but there are thousands of poor boys back home that will have to pay for the education they get. These boys at West Point or Annapolis get the finest education we give to any boy or girl in the whole land, they get it for nothing, all board paid, tuition, expenses to football games, yes, everything free.

For the life of me, I cannot see why we should bring this bill up now. Certainly you have no right to bring it in here now and ask the taxpayers to pay \$1,340,000 more after this year for the purposes contained in this legislation. Who wants it? Some men of the Army want to feather-bed some of the soft jobs we have got for the men you and I appoint. I am happy to appoint boys to West Point and Annapolis, and I know the boys that get those appointments are quite glad to receive them. I have never had one of them questioned for a minute about such a generous scholarship. They get their expenses paid all the time they are at the Academy. Oh, its grand to holla "economy" and write back to

your taxpayers that you are for economy, but if you vote for this bill I cannot see how you can honestly say you are for economy in Government. Congressmen, let us cut down on this operation of Government—not increase the operation of our Government.

Be wise and economize—vote against this bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES].

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, certain material has come to the attention of our Subcommittee on Government Publicity and Propaganda regarding the activities of the Social Security Board in this country and abroad, which seek to further the cause of socialized medicine in the United States.

All these activities in the Social Security Board appear to head up in the Bureau of Research and Statistics, which is under the immediate direction of Mr. Isadore S. Falk.

Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen is Assistant Director of the Bureau of Research and Statistics.

It is a matter of record, in the Senate hearings last year on S. 1606, that Mr. Falk was one of the principal authors of the bill presented pursuant to President Truman's national health program. That bill contemplated compulsory health insurance, and embodied every recognized feature of socialized medicine.

It has now come to the attention of our subcommittee that Mr. Falk, under date of May 14, 1947, sent a memorandum to Mr. Mitchell, Acting Commissioner for Social Security, urging that one Jacob Fisher, a member of Mr. Falk's staff, be sent to New Zealand to study compulsory health insurance in that country.

We find that this same Jacob Fisher has been documented by the House Committee on Un-American Activities for almost uninterrupted association since 1939 with various Communist-front and fellow traveler organizations. At various times Jacob Fisher has been identified with seven different groups or organizations avowedly sponsoring the Moscow party line in the United States. He has published at least one report on socialized medicine in New Zealand, in the Social Security Bulletin—a report which has been described by several reputable authorities as extremely biased and dishonest.

Our information is that Mr. Fisher would be ready to sail about June 15—that would be yesterday.

I bring this matter to the attention of the House today, because it affords a timely instance of how the taxpayers' money is being used in the executive agencies for propaganda and promotional activities never authorized by Congress.

These international junkets are an item of considerable expense. Such ac-

tivities have never been authorized, directly or indirectly, in the appropriation bills. The reports which come from such junkets often are withheld from the public until they have passed through a refining process in the Social Security Board's Bureau of Research and Statistics.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced from our investigations that the time has come for Congress to put a stop at once to all such unauthorized propaganda activities.

We are convinced that it is not the function of the Federal Government to send people around the world to bring back reports presuming to dictate a system of socialized medicine in the United States. If such a proposition were placed honestly before this Congress, I am certain it would be rejected overwhelmingly.

I conceive it to be the duty of our committee to stop such extravagant operations wherever possible.

We hold it unlawful for any executive agency to use funds for purposes beyond those contemplated by Congress in the appropriations. Here is one such case, and a peculiarly flagrant one.

I am asking Mr. Aitmeier, the Director of the Social Security Board, for a later report on Jacob Fisher's mission to New Zealand; but I deem it my duty, in the meantime, to bring this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, as well as the very full and able statement by my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY], chairman of the subcommittee, fully justify this small raise as provided in this bill. It seems to me we are losing time in dealing in pocket change when we realize that the men in the service academies are receiving today the same as they received some 28 years ago. Over a period of a quarter of a century, while everything else has gone up, they are receiving the same amount as they have for 28 years to pay for certain expenses.

This merely increases the cadet's allowance approximately \$13 a month in the two academies. Their expenses have gone up for such things as laundry, tailoring, and many other items. This modest amount of \$13 a month for the men in these two service academies is not only fully justified but it seems to me should be agreed to by the House without any great ado.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I find myself somewhat in the same position as our distinguished friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], in not having known that this bill was going to be called up on a motion to suspend the rules. But since surprise is such an important element in military tactics, I suppose it is well for us to get used to the Committee on Armed Forces indulging in it.

I had intended to offer a couple of amendments to the bill when it was on the Consent Calendar, but I think per-

haps the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee might clarify the record for me and obviate the necessity for offering the amendments.

As I read the bill and the report, I note you refer only to the cadets and midshipmen at the service academies. I realize that the bill is an amendment of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942. We have another great service academy at Kings Point, N. Y., the United States Merchant Marine Academy. That Academy was created and has been maintained under authority of the Shipping Act of 1936, and the pay and adjustment allowances of its cadets are not governed by the provisions of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942. I should like to have the chairman of the committee assure me that, in the omission of the Merchant Marine Academy from this bill and report, the committee had not purposely refrained from considering that Academy, but rather had no jurisdiction over it. Is that not true?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman has stated it correctly. Legislation for the Merchant Marine Academy should go to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. We have no jurisdiction over it whatsoever.

Mr. KEOGH. And, therefore, by not including them in this bill, it is not intended as an expression of your opinion that they should not be similarly treated?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Certainly not. I am quite certain that if the situation were otherwise the committee would have considered the Merchant Marine Academy in the same category.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I previously made, as well as the remarks I am about to make.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to speak either for or against this particular bill but rather to give you a little personal experience, from which you can draw your own conclusions.

I attended the Naval Academy some years ago. I realize it is a great institution, one of the finest in the country, and any young man should be happy to go there. However, the amount of money you get has nothing to do with what you take home. The Superintendent controls all that you get in practically every detail.

During my first year at the Academy I received the munificent sum of \$1 a month to spend. The second year, \$2 a month, and I think for the following years it went up until it was \$5 a month during my last year. Each time, as the leave period came around, my father had to send me the money to go home. At the end of this course, one which I would not have missed, and for which I am thankful to the United States and the gentlemen of the then Congresses, I owed over \$1,200 for uniforms to go out into the service. I realize that today uniforms

are not quite so magnificent as they were then, but as individual items they are more expensive.

Mr. Speaker, I give you these remarks and ask you to draw your own conclusions.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the bill has been carefully discussed and ably analyzed. It encountered very little opposition in the committee, and had there been serious weaknesses in the bill, they would have been brought out during the deliberations of the great Committee on Armed Services. This measure permits the academies to operate without a loss. In substance that is its main objective. If they did operate at a loss, we would have to make an appropriation under another name to take care of it. Cost increases all along the line make this necessary. It also provides a small additional cash allowance to cadets and midshipmen—a very small one.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. RICH. You say this is to make good to the Academy for a loss?

Mr. SIKES. In the final analysis, this act prevents the academies from operating at a loss. If they did operate at a loss, we would have to make an appropriation under another name to take care of the loss. We would not be saving money for the Government.

Mr. RICH. You mean after the great appropriations we are giving to the Army and the Navy that they are operating anything at a loss? The taxpayers are paying for all of this.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I move the previous question on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 71, noes 16.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The roll call is automatic.

The Clerk called the roll and there were—yeas 304, nays 53, not voting 72, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 80]

#### YEAS—304

Abernethy	Boggs, Del.	Chilperfield
Albert	Bonner	Clason
Allen, Calif.	Boykin	Clevenger
Allen, Ill.	Bradley	Clippinger
Allen, La.	Bramblett	Coffin
Almond	Brehm	Cole, N. Y.
Andersen,	Brooks	Colmer
H. Carl	Brophy	Cooley
Anderson, Calif.	Brown, Ga.	Cooper
Andersen,	Brown, Ohio	Corbett
August H.	Buchanan	Cotton
Andrews, Ala.	Buckley	Courtney
Andrews, N. Y.	Bulwinkle	Cravens
Angell	Burke	Crow
Arends	Burleson	Cunningham
Auchincloss	Eyrne, N. Y.	Dague
Bakewell	Camp	Davis, Ga.
Bates, Ky.	Canfield	Davis, Tenn.
Bates, Mass.	Cannon	Davis, Wis.
Battle	Carroll	Dawson, Utah
Beall	Carson	Deane
Beckworth	Case, N. J.	Delaney
Bennett, Mich.	Celler	Devitt
Blackney	Chadwick	D'Ewart
Blatnik	Chenoweth	Dingell

Dolliver	Johnson, Calif.	Peden
Domenegeaux	Johnson, Ill.	Peterson
Dondero	Johnson, Ind.	Phillips, Tenn.
Donohue	Johnson, Okla.	Pickett
Dorn	Johnson, Tex.	Ploesser
Doughton	Jones, Ala.	Plumley
Douglas	Jones, Ohio	Potts
Drewry	Jones, Wash.	Preston
Durham	Judd	Price, Fla.
Eberharter	Karsten, Mo.	Price, Ill.
Elliott	Keating	Priest
Ellis	Kee	Rabin
Elston	Keefe	Rains
Engel, Mich.	Keogh	Ramey
Engle, Calif.	Kerr	Rankin
Evins	Kersten, Wis.	Rayburn
Fallon	Kilday	Rayfield
Feighan	King	Redden
Fellows	Kirwan	Reed, Ill.
Fenton	Klein	Reeves
Fernandez	Knutson	Richards
Fisher	Kunkel	Riehlman
Flannagan	Landis	Riley
Fletcher	Lane	Rivers
Fogarty	Lanham	Rizley
Footo	Larcade	Robertson
Forand	Latham	Robison
Fulton	Lea	Rockwell
Gary	LeCompte	Rogers, Fla.
Gathings	Lemke	Rogers, Mass.
Gavin	Lesinski	Rohrbough
Gearhart	Lewis	Ross
Gillette	Lodge	Russell
Gillie	Love	Sabath
Goff	Lusk	Sadlak
Goodwin	Lyle	Sadowski
Gordon	Lynch	St. George
Gore	McConnell	Sanborn
Gorski	McCormack	Sasser
Gossett	McCowan	Scott, Hardie
Graham	McDonough	Scott,
Granger	McGarvey	Hugh D., Jr.
Grant, Ala.	McGregor	Seely-Brown
Grant, Ind.	McMillan, S. C.	Short
Gregory	Madden	Sikes
Gwynne, Iowa	Mahon	Simpson, Ill.
Hagen	Manasco	Simpson, Pa.
Hale	Mansfield,	Smathers
Hall,	Mont.	Smith, Maine
Leonard W.	Marcantonio	Smith, Va.
Halleck	Martin, Iowa	Snyder
Hardy	Meade, Md.	Spence
Harless, Ariz.	Marrow	Stigler
Harness, Ind.	Michener	Stratton
Harris	Miller, Calif.	Talle
Harrison	Miller, Conn.	Taylor
Havener	Mills	Teague
Hays	Mitchell	Thomas, N. J.
Hébert	Monroney	Thomas, Tex.
Hedrick	Morgan	Thomason
Heffernan	Morris	Tibbott
Hendricks	Morrison	Tollefson
Herter	Morton	Towe
Hess	Muhlenberg	Vall
Hill	Mundt	Van Zandt
Hinshaw	Murdock	Vorys
Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.	Walter
Hoeven	Nixon	Weichel
Hollifield	Norblad	Wheeler
Holmes	Norton	Whitten
Hope	O'Brien	Whittington
Horan	O'Hara	Wigglesworth
Howell	O'Konski	Wilson, Tex.
Jackson, Calif.	Owens	Wolverton
Jackson, Wash.	Pace	Wood
Javits	Passman	Worley
Jenison	Patterson	Youngblood
Jenkins, Ohio		Zimmermann

#### NAYS—53

Arnold	Hoffman	Rich
Banta	Huber	Rooney
Barrett	Hull	Schwabe, Mo.
Bennett, Mo.	Jarman	Schwabe, Okla.
Bryson	Jonkman	Sclivner
Buck	Kean	Smith, Kans.
Buffett	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Wis.
Byrnes, Wis.	MacKinnon	Springer
Case, S. Dak.	Mason	Stefan
Church	Meyer	Stevenson
Cole, Mo.	Miller, Md.	Sundstrom
Crawford	Miller, Nebr.	Taber
Curtis	Murray, Wis.	Trimble
Folger	O'Toole	Twyman
Griffiths	Poage	Vursell
Gross	Poulson	Wilson, Ind.
Hart	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
Heslton	Rees	

#### NOT VOTING—72

Barden	Boiton	Cole, Kans.
Bell	Busbey	Combs
Bender	Butler	Coudert
Bishop	Chapman	Cox
Bland	Chelf	Crosser
Bloom	Clark	Dawson, Ill.
Boggs, La.	Clements	Dirksen



Eaton	Kefauver	Powell
Ellsworth	Kelley	Sarbacher
Elsaesser	Kennedy	Scoblick
Fuller	Kilburn	Shafer
Gallagher	LeFevre	Sheppard
Gamble	Lucas	Smith, Ohio
Gifford	McDowell	Somers
Gwinn, N. Y.	McMahon	Stanley
Hall,	Maloney	Stockman
Edwin Arthur	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson
Hand	Mathews	Wadsworth
Hartley	Meade, Ky.	Weich
Jenkins, Pa.	Nodar	West
Jennings	Norrell	Williams
Jensen	Patman	Winstead
Jones, N. C.	Pfeifer	Wolcott
Kearney	Phillips	
Kearns	Phillips, Calif.	

So two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Wadsworth with Mr. Mahon.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Lucas.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Somers.
Mr. Butler with Mr. Kefauver.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Norrell.
Mr. Le Fevre with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Busbey with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Bishop with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Stanley.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Cole of Kansas, with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky, with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Nodar with Mr. Clark.
Mr. McMahon with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. Bloom.
Mr. Jensen with Mr. Crosser.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Mansfield of Texas.
Mr. Hand with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Mathews with Mr. Winstead.
Mr. Bender with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Gwinn of New York, with Mr. Combs.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. West.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 248) for printing in the RECORD:

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived; and it shall also be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order any amendment to said bill prohibiting the use of the funds appropriated in such bill or any funds heretofore made available, including contract authorizations, for the purchase of any particular site or for the erection of any particular hospital.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

#### PROVIDING SUPPORT FOR WOOL

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, and 3.

And agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 3 of the House engrossed amendments, beginning with the word "That" in line 16, strike out through and including the period in line 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That no proclamation under this section with respect to wool shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is now a party."

And the House agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,  
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,  
ANTON J. JOHNSON,  
WILLIAM S. HILL,  
STEPHEN PACE,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

GEORGE D. AIKEN,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,  
ELMER THOMAS,  
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the House Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

Under the amendment of the House numbered 4, the "Wool Act of 1947" was brought within the scope of the provisions of Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as reenacted and amended, with the exception that no quantitative limitations could be imposed by the President under the authority of section 22 upon the total quantities of wool or products thereof which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption in the United States. The Senate receded from its disagreement to this amendment with an amendment which deleted the provision placing a limitation upon the power of the President to impose quantitative restrictions upon the

amount of wool or products thereof which may be imported and which provided that no action could be taken under the authority of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as reenacted and amended, with respect to wool which would be in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is a party on the date of the enactment of the Wool Act of 1947.

The bill (S. 814), as agreed to in conference, would empower the President to protect any program conducted under the Wool Act of 1947 in the same manner and by the same methods as he is now authorized to protect programs conducted under the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as reenacted and amended, the Social Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and section 32 of Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, was first enacted on August 24, 1935. It was subsequently reenacted in 1937 and has been amended twice, the last time being on January 25, 1940. The provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as reenacted and amended, are designed to protect programs conducted to aid domestic agriculture by empowering the President, whenever he has reason to believe, and finds after an investigation conducted by the Tariff Commission, that any one or more articles are being, or are practically certain to be, imported into the United States under such conditions and in sufficient quantities as to render, or tend to render, ineffective or materially interfere with any program conducted under the provisions of the laws enumerated above, to impose such fees on, or such limitations on the total quantities of, any article or articles which may be imported as he finds to be necessary in order that the importations of such article or articles will not render, or tend to render, ineffective or materially interfere with programs conducted under the specific laws enumerated above.

Since the date of the enactment of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933) in 1935, the President has on several occasions made effective use of the authority granted herein to protect certain agricultural programs. That authority was exercised as recently as February 1, 1947, when harsh or rough cotton having a staple length less than  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch was made subject to an import quota.

The amendment providing "That no proclamation under this section with respect to wool shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is now a party" makes it clear that there can be no conflict in any action authorized to be taken under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as reenacted and amended, with respect to wool and any international agreement or treaty to which the United States is a party on the date of the enactment of this act.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,  
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,  
ANTON J. JOHNSON,  
WILLIAM S. HILL,  
STEPHEN PACE,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, several changes have been made in the wool bill during the course of its consideration by Congress. During this period, sensational and exaggerated statements have been made as to the effect it might have on the reciprocal trade agreement program and the current meeting at Geneva to set up an International Trade Organization. In my

opinion, the legislation in the form adopted by the conferees is entirely in harmony with the policies which has been followed by this administration with reference to foreign trade and domestic price supports.

In view of the changes which have been made, I desire to call attention to just what the bill does in its present form:

First. It is emergency legislation expiring on December 31, 1948, and provides that during that period the price of wool shall be supported by the Commodity Credit Corporation at the same price it supported wool in 1946. The effect is to give wool the same protection which has been given numerous other agricultural commodities in the way of support prices during the so-called Steagall period.

Second. The bill authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of its present stocks of wool, notwithstanding any restriction at present imposed upon such disposition by law. Under existing law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from selling wool at less than parity. This has resulted in the accumulation of stocks approximating 460,000,000 pounds. To this will be added the 1947 and 1948 clips, each of which it is estimated will run about 300,000,000 pounds. Thus, if Commodity Credit should find it necessary to produce these clips and could not dispose of any of its stocks at prevailing prices, it would find itself at the end of 1948 with over a billion pounds of wool. In the meantime, domestic requirements would have been met from imports. It is hoped, through the provisions of this bill, to liquidate these stocks without substantial loss, and it is the hope also that much of the 1947 and 1948 clips can be purchased in the normal course of trade and will not have to be handled by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Third. Section 4 of the bill as approved by the conferees brings wool within all the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, legislation which has been on the statute books ever since 1935, and which applies to a number of agricultural commodities upon which price supports are in effect. Under the provisions of section 22, if the President has reason to believe that imports are rendering a price support program ineffective or are materially interfering with the same, he shall refer the matter to the Tariff Commission for an investigation and report. If, as a result of that report, he finds that imports are interfering with the program, then he is authorized to impose either a quota or an import fee in order to make the price support program effective.

Section 22, sponsored and proposed by the Roosevelt administration, has been amended by Congress and approved by the President several times since 1935, and action under its provisions has been taken on various occasions by both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. The latest action in this respect was on February 1, 1947, when quotas were imposed upon imports of harsh cotton. In all cases so far quotas, rather than fees, have been used. The legislation has operated concurrently with, and supple-

mental to, the reciprocal trade agreement program. It has been used to harmonize and reconcile the administration's domestic price support program on price support commodities with its foreign trade policy. Something of this sort has been and is necessary because there is a considerable measure of inconsistency between the two policies.

The inclusion of wool in section 22 is entirely in harmony with the letter and spirit of the law as it has been applied in the past. It merely gives the President the authority and machinery to protect a price support program if he finds it is endangered by imports.

The bill in its final form, like most bills on controversial subjects, makes an effort to harmonize conflicting viewpoints. I think that has been done to the maximum extent in this instance.

There is general agreement that because of conditions arising out of the war emergency, and particularly because of the great accumulation of wool stocks in this country and in the world, some stabilization measures are necessary. In the case of domestic wool, the most effective measure seems to be to continue the 1946 price supports until December 31, 1948. In this instance, just as in any effort to support prices above current market quotations, the cost is likely to reach excessive proportions unless there can be some control over the quantity coming on the market from either domestic or foreign sources. This has been recognized in all our price support legislation and is the basis of section 22.

A special effort has been made by the conferees to make sure that the bill is not out of harmony with the administration's foreign trade policy. We have provided that no proclamation issued by the President under this act shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is now a party. This protects the rights and interests which any other nation may have by reason of existing trade treaties.

The provisions of the bill are in entire harmony with the proposed charter of the International Trade Organization of the United Nations. Paragraph I of article 25 of that document provides for a general limitation of quantitative restrictions; however, with a number of exceptions, among which is the following:

2. The provisions of paragraph I of this article shall not extend to the following:

(a) Prohibitions or restrictions on imports or exports imposed or maintained during the early postwar transitional period which are essential to—

(iii) The orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the government of any member or of industries developed in the territory of any member owing to the exigencies of the war which it would be uneconomic to maintain in normal conditions.

The situation which exists in this country with reference to wool stocks clearly comes within the provisions of subsection (a) (iii).

The bill is also in harmony with the spirit of article 34 of the charter of the International Trade Organization relating to emergency action on imports of particular products.

The legislation is also in entire accord with the Executive Order dated February 25, 1947, which directs that every trade agreement hereafter entered into shall include an escape clause. This Executive order was issued after consultation with Senators VANDENBERG and MILLIKIN, and pursuant to an agreement reached between them and the Secretary of State. Part I of this Executive order reads as follows:

1. There shall be included in every trade agreement hereafter entered into under the authority of said act of June 12, 1934, as amended, a clause providing in effect that if, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concession granted by the United States on any article in the trade agreement, such article is being imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause, or threaten, serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, the United States shall be free to withdraw the concession, in whole or in part, to modify it, to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent such injury.

2. The United States Tariff Commission, upon the request of the President, upon his own motion, or upon application of any interested party when in the judgment of the Tariff Commission there is good and sufficient reason therefor, shall make an investigation to determine whether, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concession granted on any article by the United States in a trade agreement containing such a clause, such article is being imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles. Should the Tariff Commission find, as a result of its investigation, that such injury is being caused or threatened, the Tariff Commission shall recommend to the President, for his consideration in the light of the public interest, the withdrawal of the concession, in whole or in part, or the modification of the concession, to the extent and for such time as the Tariff Commission finds would be necessary to prevent such injury.

3. In the course of any investigation under the preceding paragraph, the Tariff Commission shall hold public hearings, giving reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings. The procedure and rules and regulations for such investigations and hearings shall from time to time be prescribed by the Tariff Commission.

On the same day that this order was issued, the Under Secretary of State gave out a statement that the escape clause so authorized would be along the lines of the escape clause in the Mexican agreement. That escape clause in effect provides for the imposition by the President of quotas or other customs treatment when he finds that the same is necessary to prevent serious injury to domestic producers because of concessions granted in reciprocal trade agreements.

It is my opinion that if the wool bill becomes a law, the provisions of section 22 will never have to be used. Practically all the world's wool which is in competition with our own is in the hands of the British Empire sales organization known as JO—joint organization. Although it has wider powers, JO corresponds roughly to our Commodity Credit Corporation when it comes to handling



Australian, New Zealand, and South African wool stocks, which accumulated during and since the war. Both Under-Secretary Clayton of the State Department and Under-Secretary Dodd of the Agriculture Department stated to the conference committee that these countries have advised that they would be glad to sit around the table and work out a plan for the orderly disposition of surplus wool stocks. That is the sensible thing to do. However, it has not been done and probably will not be done if this legislation is not passed.

If we give the President the authority to protect our wool price support program through the use of quotas or other customs treatment, as recognized in the ITO charter and the escape clause in our reciprocal trade agreements, and as have been in effect on other commodities through section 22 for many years, I predict that an agreement will soon be reached between the British Empire countries and the United States for the orderly liquidation of these troublesome wool stocks. Such an agreement would be to the benefit of all countries concerned and would enable us to liquidate our wool stocks with little, if any, loss to the Treasury. At least, it would greatly lessen the losses.

Since this bill does not in any way increase or decrease the domestic supply of wool, it cannot affect the quantity of ultimate wool imports. Whether this legislation becomes a law or not, we are going to consume the wool now owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation as well as the clips of 1947 and 1948. Whatever we need in addition we will have to import. The only question involved is the sale of the accumulated stocks in an orderly manner and in such a way as to cause the least loss to the United States Treasury.

Wool is a strategic material—so recognized by the Army. In the present state of international affairs, it is essential that we maintain a domestic wool industry. Even with price supports, it has been declining. This legislation does not attempt to solve the long time problem of the wool industry. It merely seeks to bridge the present emergency, due in the main to market dislocations and stock accumulations during the war. There has been no wool market since April 15. Practically all of the 1947 clip is unsold.

It is essential that the conference report be adopted and that the bill become a law at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. With reference to the wool which the Commodity Credit Corporation holds, you stated that if they were directed to they would dispose of the wool. Is it contemplated that they will dispose of the wool at a loss which will have to be made up by the Federal Treasury?

Mr. HOPE. Under this bill it is hoped that it will not be necessary to dispose of the wool at a loss. We hope there can be some orderly arrangement made whereby this country will not be flooded with imports and that the wool on hand at the present time and that which may be brought under this act may be dis-

posed of in an orderly way without any loss to the Treasury.

It is possible, of course, that there may be some loss, but we are authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell the wool to the best advantage. The thing to do is to get the wool out of the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation and get it into trade channels.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman regard the authority conferred upon the President under section 22 to impose quotas or an import fee as mandatory or as discretionary with the President?

Mr. HOPE. The authority is certainly discretionary; the President, of course, must act upon the findings that are laid before him by the Tariff Commission, but it is still up to the President to determine whether or not imports are interfering with the domestic price-support program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. If it is left that way, does the gentleman think that under the law it is discretionary with the President?

Mr. HOPE. It is up to the President to determine whether or not the facts as found by the Tariff Commission reveal a situation which calls upon him to act.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then, if in his judgment such a situation is revealed, then no matter what his personal views may be, under the law he should act; should he not?

Mr. HOPE. If in his judgment the President felt that the facts were such as required him to act, certainly I would expect him to act in good faith.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the first place, the words "whenever the President has reason to believe" does not leave anything to his discretion. If you and I were President, even if we did not want to act in a certain way, but we had reason to believe a certain thing, then under that language it would be our duty to act; would it not?

Mr. HOPE. If the President has reason to believe, then he should submit the matter to the Tariff Commission for a finding as to the facts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then, if he believes the recommendation of the Tariff Commission is correct on the evidence he should act, should he not?

Mr. HOPE. If he believes that it calls for action, certainly he should act.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is, he should act whether or not his opinion is otherwise.

Mr. HOPE. Let me give the gentleman an illustration. The question might come up in the President's mind as to whether the fact that the United States Treasury was losing money in supporting the price of wool constituted an interference with the price-support program. That would be a question which the President would have to decide in his own mind. The gentleman from Massachusetts might say that the

fact that the Treasury of the United States was losing money on this transaction constituted an interference. I might say it did not. There is certainly plenty of room there for the President to exercise discretion.

Mr. McCORMACK. But that would not be discretion. That would be judgment, I submit to the gentleman, who is very fair. The question of discretion and judgment are two different things.

Mr. HOPE. Well, the gentleman can use whichever word he prefers to use in that connection, but I say it is finally up to the President to make his decision based upon the facts as submitted by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The law specifically states that the President must find the existence of such facts; so that he can use his independent judgment on the situation, irrespective of the findings of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. HOPE. Yes. After the report of the Tariff Commission is laid before the President, he must make an independent finding that facts exist which would require him to issue a proclamation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would yield the minority one-half of the time.

Mr. HOPE. I think I have too many calls for time. I would not be able to yield the gentleman from North Carolina half of the time.

Mr. COOLEY. So that we have half of the time on this side for discussion.

Mr. HOPE. I will be glad to yield the gentleman 10 minutes at this time, if he desires it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the war, the world's greatest crisis, a rather magnificent spirit of cooperation permeated the Allied world. As a result of that grand world-wide spirit of cooperation and under the urgent spur of necessity, gallant men won many great victories on the battlefields of the world. This great spirit of cooperation was in all respects nonpartisan. Men of all parties and of many countries died in a common cause. VE-day and VJ-day have come and gone, and we are now living in the postwar world. Frankly, I am shocked to know that apparently some people now seem to regard world cooperation as a matter of little importance. Unless we solve the problems of peace in this postwar world, the great victories which have been won will have been won in vain. The fruits of those victories will be lost in the burning and consuming flames of economic isolation.

I do not believe that the average American today fears atomic warfare. Fortunately our great Nation has the secrets of the atomic bomb. I do believe, however, that intelligent men everywhere very greatly fear the dangers of economic warfare which may be just as devastating to the hope of peace as atomic warfare could possibly be. This measure is the first overt act. It is economic warfare. The great issue involved here is the issue of economic

isolation against world cooperation. In the proper solution of this great problem, you have just as great interest as I could possibly have. I am influenced not by editorials which have been written, but because of my own firm belief that the problems of this distressed and devastated world can only be solved by cooperation on a world-wide basis.

Economic isolation means economic warfare. Economic warfare certainly does not mean peace. We have experienced the tragic results of economic isolation. Twice in our day and generation the earth has been bathed in human blood. I am fortified and strengthened in my belief by the opinions of eminent statesmen—statesmen of different political faiths, yet statesmen all of whom are true Americans. I have before me a communication written by the Honorable Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State, a great Democrat, and a great American. I also have here a communication from another distinguished former Secretary of State, the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, a distinguished Republican, and a great American. And here is a communication from a great soldier, a great statesman, and a great American, the present Secretary of State, Gen. George C. Marshall. To the list of these witnesses we can add the present Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, the Honorable Will Clayton, our able and distinguished representative at the Geneva Conference; and the honorable and distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, our former colleague, Clinton Anderson; and the Under Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable N. E. Dodd; all of whom agree that no action should be taken here which would violate either the letter or the spirit of the charter of the Geneva Conference and jeopardize the hope for world cooperation in the field of world trade and commerce.

Please consider these communications:

NAVAL HOSPITAL,  
Bethesda, Md., June 4, 1947.

The Honorable GEORGE C. MARSHALL,  
Secretary of State.

MY DEAR SECRETARY MARSHALL: I have been very disturbed to learn of Mr. Clayton's return from Geneva in connection with the possibility of action by the Congress intended to increase the tariff on wool. I believe that such action would seriously endanger the success of the negotiations now going on in Geneva for the reduction of trade barriers under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and for the establishment of an international trade organization, embodying the basic principles of mutually beneficial international economic relations for which we have striven so long.

After more than a decade of successful operation under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and at a time when the principal trading nations of the world are prepared to follow our lead in carrying out a program of economic disarmament, it would be tragic indeed if any action of ours should endanger that program.

I do not wish to pass judgment on whether or not the growers of wool in this country are entitled to additional assistance. That is for the Congress to decide. I do feel very strongly, however, that such assistance, if given, should not be in a form which would preclude or nullify the comprehensive negotiations in which we are now engaged with other countries for the reciprocal reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers. The suc-

cess of these negotiations is indispensable to our own economic stability and prosperity and for the creation of a climate favorable to the preservation of world peace.

The form in which domestic wool producers receive price support must not jeopardize our international relations. As the President said in his address at Waco, Tex., on March 6: "The negotiations at Geneva must not fail."

Faithfully yours,

CORDELL HULL.

[Copy of telegram dated June 4, 1947, from the Honorable Henry L. Stimson to the Secretary of State]

The Honorable GEORGE C. MARSHALL,  
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am deeply concerned regarding the pending wool legislation in Congress. In the form proposed by the House of Representatives, this legislation would increase the tariff on wool.

It is my considered opinion that to enact the House measure at any time would be most unwise. It would amount to a repudiation of the whole structure of American economic policy developed in the Congress and the State Department during the 15 years since Cordell Hull began his great work for trade agreements. And such repudiation now, when American leadership has been so largely responsible for the Conference on World Trade at present proceeding in Geneva, would not fail to have serious and immediate international effect, both economic and political. To other nations now watching for proof of American sincerity and unity it would be a shocking indication that the policy of the United States can at any time be shackled by the sort of economic shortsightedness for which all the world has paid so dearly in recent years.

After World War I, the American people and others executed an economic and political retreat from world affairs. These policies were in large part responsible for the great economic break-down which followed both here and in Europe. Now we are engaged in effort to reconstruct a world shattered by the war which grew out of that economic break-down. In this effort of reconstruction greater freedom of world trade is indispensable. No such freedom can be achieved if this country retreats behind tariff walls higher than ever.

To enact any provision raising the wool tariff would be a clear first step toward the disastrous repetition of our former error. If the Congress should determine that the price of wool must be supported, a question on which I do not here offer any judgment, it can accomplish this purpose at relatively small cost by employing the method of subsidies contained in the Senate bill. But to support these prices by raising the tariff on wool should be to give financial assistance to a few at the cost of a large share of this Nation's hope for world prosperity and peace.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, June 4, 1947.

The Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I wish to express appreciation to the Senate and House conferees in hearing the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs with respect to pending legislation on wool. I am sure Mr. Clayton made clear the serious issues involved from the point of view of our foreign policy. However, I wish to summarize the position of the Department of State in this matter.

The Senate bill directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue until December 31, 1948, to support a price to domestic producers of wool at the same price at which it purchased domestic wool in 1946. It authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation

to dispose of wool owned by it at market prices.

The House added to this bill a provision intended to result in an increase in the high tariff on wool, and thus enable the Government to give this support to domestic wool producers without financial loss to this Government. The cost of such support would thus be passed on to the consumer of woolen goods.

The critical importance of this action, as it bears on our foreign relations, arises from the fact that there is in progress at this very time in Geneva, an international conference on trade and employment called by the United Nations on the initiative of this country. The United States delegation, of which Mr. Clayton is chairman, is taking a leading part in this conference.

The object of the conference is to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements for the reduction of barriers and the elimination of discriminations in international trade. A further object is to agree upon a draft of a charter for an international trade organization to be set up under the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Some 50 or 60 negotiations are actually taking place between the different countries represented at this conference, and it is expected that eventually some 70 or 80 agreements will be entered into. The participation of the United States in this aspect of the proceedings derives from the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act last extended by Congress in 1945.

While wool constitutes a relatively small part of our domestic economy, being only one-half of 1 percent of agricultural income, it is a highly important commodity in other countries. For example, it forms 90 percent of the value of all of the exports of Australia to the United States.

The question here is whether the best interests of the United States will be served by the passage of the Senate wool bill which affords protection to the domestic wool producers at a relatively small cost to the United States Treasury, or by the adoption of the House version of the bill which would provide this protection by further raising barriers to international trade. The Department of State is strongly of the opinion that the Senate bill provides the only acceptable course of action open to us not wholly inconsistent with our current efforts to remove the cause of serious conflicts in the world economic field.

I am taking the liberty of passing on to you herewith the views on this subject of our most distinguished elder statesmen—Mr. Stimson and Mr. Hull.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL,  
Secretary of State.

(Enclosures: Letter to Secretary Marshall from Hon. Cordell Hull dated June 4, 1947. Copy of telegram to Secretary Marshall from Hon. H. L. Stimson dated June 4, 1947.)

MAY 22, 1947.

The Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. COOLEY: I take pleasure in this opportunity to answer your inquiry of May 19 concerning the views of the Department of State with respect to proposed wool legislation. I refer to S. 814, a bill to provide support for wool and for other purposes, as passed by the Senate and reported favorably with amendments by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

The bill in the form in which it was reported was not under consideration by the Committee on Agriculture when representatives of the Department testified before that body. We have not had a formal opportunity to present our views on the legislation, as it has been reported.



S. 814, as reported with amendments, is intended to achieve three main objectives. First, it directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to support a price to wool producers at the 1946 level until December 31, 1948. This provision is consistent with the proposed long-run program for wool submitted by the President in his memorandum to Senator O'MAHONEY on March 11, 1946. The Department of State believes this section of the bill accomplishes the essentials of the administration's plan which recognizes that wool should receive support comparable to that granted to other agricultural commodities.

Secondly, S. 814 authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell its stocks of wool without regard to restrictions imposed upon it by law. That is necessary because Commodity Credit Corporation must be able to sell wool at the market if it is to dispose of its stocks. This is also consistent with the President's program in the opinion of the Department of State.

Thirdly, an amendment to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act has been added to provide for the imposition of fees on any imported article by the Secretary of Agriculture if he finds that imports of said article interfere materially with the wool-support program. The accompanying report shows that the purpose of the fee is to increase the price of imported wool to equal the support level for domestic wool. The Department of State advises against the adoption of this amendment. I understand from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that it is proposed to modify this import-free amendment by directing the President, rather than the Secretary of Agriculture, to impose the fees after investigation by the Tariff Commission. This does not remove the fundamental objections to the provision.

If import fees, which are actually increases in the tariff, are levied, they would be harmful to the interests of the United States in the following ways.

First, the cost to the public in increased prices for woollen manufactures would far exceed the increased returns to the wool growers. The President's memorandum, previously referred to, pointed out that "it will be more desirable from a national point of view and more dependable for growers to have the Government absorb losses on sales of domestic wool rather than to raise additional trade barriers against imports." The cost of supporting returns to wool growers must be borne by the public of the United States regardless of the form that support takes. The tariff itself is a subsidy which is collected, like a sales tax, from consumers through raised prices and conveyed to producers by the same means. To talk about avoiding cost to the Treasury is to evade the issue, for the public, and not the Treasury, pays the bill.

A fee will raise the cost of the raw material. This, in turn, cumulatively increases the cost of doing business at every stage of the production process. Therefore, the final cost to the public as a consumer is far greater under the fee than it would be if raw material prices were not increased by fees and the public, as a taxpayer, paid the subsidy.

In the second place, new import fees on wool would injure the interests of the United States through their effect on our foreign relations. We all recognize the responsibility of this country for leadership, both political and economic, in the postwar world. The United States has taken the initiative in promoting the adoption of principles of economic conduct among nations which would require each country to consider the impact of the economic measures it undertakes on world economic progress. If the proposed amendment providing new import barriers is adopted, the moral leadership of the United States in world affairs will suffer a serious blow.

If at this time, when we are actually negotiating with other countries at Geneva for the lowering of trade barriers, we raise new barriers as this bill proposes, we stand convicted of insincerity.

Wool is a critical item in our current negotiations for an International Trade Organization for the expansion of world trade and employment. Although wool raising accounts for less than one-half of 1 percent of our agricultural income, it is very important in world trade. It is the most important import into the United States from Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. It is by far their most important source of the dollars they need so badly to buy our exports. If we impose new barriers to this trade, we cannot expect them to cooperate wholeheartedly in creating the type of post-war world we want to have. Without such cooperation, the other British Commonwealth nations would have difficulty joining with us in a mutually advantageous program. Other nations would question the sincerity of our protestations that we do not intend to retreat to economic isolationism.

Let me summarize by saying the Department approves support to wool growers and authority for Commodity Credit Corporation to sell its wool below parity. The Department therefore hopes that the Congress will adopt the proposed bill as passed by the Senate without amendment.

Sincerely yours,

CLAYTON.

Mr. Speaker, although I do not have before me communications from the Secretary of Agriculture or the Under Secretary, there can be no misunderstanding as to their position concerning this important matter. During the conference, Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Dodd, addressed a letter to Senator AIKEN in which the position of the Department of Agriculture was clearly indicated.

America has taken her rightful place among the nations of the earth. The question is: "Shall we be able to hold that great place of leadership?" We were the first to sponsor world cooperation. Our Nation renounced economic isolation, but now we are about to embrace the evil vulture again. The question before us is one of paramount importance. I hope that I am not unduly alarmed and I also hope that I do not overrate the importance of the matter before us. Certainly the great statesmen whom I have quoted seem to regard the matter as one of great importance. As we approach a vote on this conference report, we are conscious of the fact that a conference of world-wide importance is going on at Geneva, but America, the greatest of all nations, is not represented there. Our representative, Mr. Clayton, was forced to abandon, temporarily at least, the great work which he had undertaken at Geneva and all because of this pending wool bill. Mr. Clayton has been anxious to return to Geneva, but he dares not return until this issue has been settled. How could he sit at the conference table and attempt to negotiate reciprocal agreements looking toward the revival of world trade conscious of the contents of this bill which supplies the president with a sword with which to destroy every agreement which might be reached and written?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. When Mr. Will Clayton returned from Geneva and when the letters to which the gentleman refers from Mr. Stimson, Mr. Hull and General Marshall were written, the conference committee had not met; no conference report had been made. I will ask the gentleman if they were not referring to an entirely different bill than the one we have before us at this time?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I might say in answer to the gentleman from Kansas that Mr. Clayton and the State Department are just as opposed to this conference report and the bill in its present form as they were to the bill reported by the House committee. They would have no objection; Mr. Clayton would not be in the United States today, if the House committee had reported and the House itself had passed the bill that the Senate passed, which was what we thought the wool people wanted—that was a support for the price of wool.

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly what the wool producers wanted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield that I may answer?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Clayton is certainly a very hard man to please. We have come a long way trying to please him.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. It is not a question of pleasing Mr. Clayton, I might say. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is exactly what I desire to say; it is not a question of pleasing Mr. Clayton. It is whether or not we are going to cooperate with the remainder of the world in order that they may take our surplus. They cannot take our surplus goods unless we take theirs. Money does not cross the ocean to balance trade; it is goods for goods, now as it has always been.

Mr. COOLEY. May I add that on June 12, 1947, just last Thursday, General Marshall issued this statement:

I am disappointed in the reported action of the Senate and House conference with respect to the wool bill. I am making public my letter to the conferees together with a telegram from Mr. Stimson and the letter from Mr. Hull referred to therein.

The truth is the officials of the State Department were not given an opportunity to be heard about this all important matter affecting our foreign economic policy. The House amendment was not written by the Members of the House Committee on Agriculture and no hearings on the proposal were held. It is unfortunate that this matter originated as it did and came before the House Committee on Agriculture. Our Committee deals entirely with agricultural problems, but this bill vitally affects world trade and commerce and the foreign economic policy of our Nation, and is in fact a revenue measure attached to a bill which originated in the Senate. Under our Constitution, revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives. The constitutional question involved seems to be of very slight importance to the ardent

advocates of "false economy." If you by your vote approve this conference report, you have in effect delegated to our committee the right and function to fix and impose tariffs and to delegate that authority as we may determine. If we are to provide for a tariff on wool, why not on potatoes, tomatoes, cucumbers, cauliflowers, and every other vegetable and product of agriculture?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Our committee has had that right ever since 1935 when we got the first tariff containing section 22. Since that time, potatoes, tomatoes and all other commodities have been under that bill any time the President chooses to exercise his authority to deal with them.

Mr. COOLEY. Not with import duties as here provided. The gentleman must know that he is not accurate.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman says I know that is not accurate. The fact is that the import fee provision has been in the bill ever since 1940.

Mr. COOLEY. Has it been used on any commodity other than a surplus crop upon which we have a definite program? Certainly not, because the language of section 22 so provides.

Mr. HOPE. It has been in the bill ever since 1940. It has not been used as yet, but it has been available for use at any time.

Mr. COOLEY. Here is one test of what this bill involves. If it is not the purpose to destroy reciprocal trade agreements now in existence or hereafter to be negotiated, then why do the House conferees object to this language which is written in a bill sponsored by my distinguished and beloved friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], introduced on February 10, 1947, in which he provides in clear, unambiguous language the following:

No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party.

If it is not the purpose to destroy the reciprocal trade program, why do we not send this bill back to conference and insist that the conferees put that savings clause in this bill? I say it is nothing more nor less than an insidious effort to undermine the reciprocal trade treaty program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Members in this House who are interested in the farm program that when you destroy the support program for wool you are undermining and will ultimately destroy the entire agricultural support program because the two things are certainly going in opposite directions. You can support the wool industry of America better than you can any other agricultural commodity grown in the

country. The whole wool crop produced in America is worth approximately \$120,000,000. We produce only about one-third of the wool we consume. In round figures, we produce about 300,000,000 pounds annually. This could be subsidized to the extent of even 5 cents a pound and it would only involve \$15,000,000 a year. If we abandon the support program and lift trade barriers the public will pay not just \$15,000,000 but probably \$150,000,000. Do not you believe that the extraction will be painless. It will be long remembered and very painful to the consuming public. It is estimated that the public will pay 10 times more than the direct subsidy involved.

The issue of economic isolation involved in this legislation cannot be compromised. We either believe in world cooperation or we believe in economic isolation. We cannot divorce this bill from the reciprocal trade treaty program. The effect of this bill will be to drive this Nation into the tragic arms of economic isolation which means economic ruin. If economic isolation is to be the policy of America, the people of America should know it and the people of the world should know it. If the President signs this bill, our diplomats will be damned in the eyes of the people of the world and the integrity, the prestige, power, and influence of our Nation will be irreparably impaired. I hope, therefore, that this report will be recommitted or defeated.

Here is a statement by the Secretary of State, issued on May 29, 1947:

The State Department is opposed to the House amendment to the wool legislation now under consideration. Wool is the key commodity in the Geneva negotiations to expand trade through the reduction of trade barriers. It is by far the most important export and source of dollars of Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa. We cannot expect them to cooperate with us in reducing trade barriers if we increase duties on their wool. Without their participation, the remainder of the British Commonwealth cannot, as a practical matter, join with us in a mutually advantageous program.

Wool is also a symbol of our intentions in foreign trade. If we adopt higher tariffs in the present bill, other nations will conclude we cannot or will not live up to our professed policy of international cooperation. They will turn to trade restrictions and bilateralism to protect themselves. On the other hand, expanding trade between the United States and other nations will not only help us sell our surplus products but also will allow them to earn the dollars they need to reconstruct their economies and to protect their democratic institutions.

The wool bill as passed by the Senate would protect the wool industry in the United States by direct payments from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The indirect cost of these payments to the public as taxpayers would be far less than the cost of the increased tariff provided by the House amendment to the public as consumers.

I am anxious for the wool producers of America to be protected. I favor the passage of the Senate bill, but even though I am greatly interested in the welfare of the wool producers I am not willing to permit my interest in them to bring about a devastating collapse of the Geneva Conference and of the hope for a revival of world trade and commerce by world cooperation and reciprocity.

The sponsors of this measure are making goats out of the sheep growers of America, and as a direct result of the politics involved the wool market has dropped 14 cents a pound below the support price of 42 cents a pound, which would have been guaranteed under the Senate bill. If the wool producers of America end up with no support program whatever, I believe they will know exactly where to place the responsibility. It is easy enough for Members to say we want to protect the wool growers, and yet, at the same time, attach provisions in the form of amendments which they know will defeat the very thing that they say they actually want to do.

As some evidence of the politics involved, I call your attention to an AP report under a Washington date line of May 13:

WILL DRAFT WOOL BILL—GOP GROUP NAMED TO EXPEDITE ACTION

WASHINGTON, May 13.—A special committee on wool legislation was appointed today by the House Republican steering committee.

Representative HALLECK, of Indiana, said that an effort will be made to draft a bill to satisfy all wool men.

"There are a number of difficult decisions to be made," HALLECK told reporters. "We are anxious to satisfy everyone and will try to expedite action."

The Senate has passed legislation to provide price support at the 1946 level, and permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell its stocks of wool at prices competitive with foreign wool. The House added a provision for an import fee, to apply on excess foreign imports and floor stocks.

The new provision, particularly the floor-stock tax, has drawn opposition from the wool dealers and fabricators.

HALLECK said the committee will meet tomorrow morning. Its members are Representatives HOPE, of Kansas, MURRAY of Wisconsin, SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, JENKINS of Iowa, CASE of South Dakota, HERTER, of Massachusetts, and HALLECK.

You will note that not a single member of the Democratic Party was named as a member of the Halleck committee.

It is unfortunate that the wool growers of America must be made scapegoats by the Republican steering committee. This is the little black sheep of the Republican Party, a wolf in sheep's clothing which will destroy the farm program and the hope of world cooperation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, after all of the arguments are stripped down, there is but one issue before the House this afternoon and that is whether or not we will accord to the commodity wool the same rights and the same privileges that some 20 or 30 other agricultural commodities now enjoy. That is the issue, because the sole purpose of amending section 22, as set out in the conference report, is to bring wool under that section.

Now, let me read to you some of the commodities that now have the protection that is proposed here to give to wool, and please do not smile when I tell you those commodities extend from noodle soup to wheat and cotton. I want to read you from a list of the commodities that are now protected under section 22, and the issue here is whether or not you will bring wool under section 22.



Now, here are some of the commodities. The President has not acted on all of them. He has acted only on two, wheat and cotton, but here are the ones on which the President could act. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, is frightened that we will wreck the reciprocal-trade treaties of this Nation. There is no such thing involved here. Here are some of the commodities now under section 22:

Beans, beets, cabbages, carrots, onions, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, spinach, noodle soup, orange juice, tomato flakes, cotton, wheat flour, wheat, milk, eggs, apples, peaches, kale, peas, squash, and grapefruit juice.

Every one of them are under section 22, and if those commodities are imported into this country in large quantities the President can initiate an investigation and can do one of two things, that is, establish import quotas or import fees on the imports.

Now, I want to be helpful if I can. Let me give you just a little history. It has been stated here that section 22 was intended only to protect surplus commodities and therefore was not intended to protect wool, because wool is largely an import commodity. I have gone back to 1935 when section 22 was first enacted. This is the committee report dated June 15, 1935, filed in this House by Marvin Jones, then chairman of the Agricultural Committee, and with reference to section 22, then new legislation, here is what the committee said:

Efforts to restore agricultural prices in this country will not be wholly successful if competitive foreign imported articles are allowed to take the domestic market away from the domestic products.

Further, it says:

Congress cannot now ascertain and provide specifically for the varieties of circumstances under which, and the commodities the importation of which, will endanger the effort to attain parity prices.

In this bill before the House we are proposing to support wool at the parity price and section 22 was enacted for that specific purpose.

Now, the original section 22 authorized only import quotas; that is, we could limit the amount coming into this country. In 1939 this Congress amended that act and added the right to impose import fees up to 50 percent ad valorem. And here is what the committee report, also filed by Marvin Jones, dated July 14, 1939, had to say about this section and the need for including import fees:

It is clearly necessary for the successful operation of such programs that some means, such as is provided in section 22, be available to prevent a backwash of low-priced exports into a higher-priced domestic market.

• • • It is known to a point of overwhelming certainty that a particular farm program will be ineffective in the absence of some protection against increased foreign importations. Consequently, the bill provides that restrictions (either an importation fee or an importation quota) against foreign importations may be imposed under the provisions of section 22 whenever it appears to be reasonably certain that such importations would increase and affect a farm program adversely.

It has been stated here that the President must act and has no discretion in these cases. I say that neither the law nor the practice requires such a thing. In the first place, under section 22, under which it is proposed to bring wool, no action can be taken unless it is initiated by the President of the United States, and then subsection (d) states that the decision of the President on the fact is final.

The newspapers have published throughout this country that this bill imposes a 50-percent ad valorem on the import of wool. It does no such thing. The maximum the President could impose is 50 percent, as the law says it shall not be in excess of 50 percent. The President could impose a fee of 1 percent, 10 percent, or 50 percent, as he saw fit.

Then, mind you, the act specifically provides that if the President should impose a fee he may at any time revoke it, suspend it, or modify it.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] said that probably the President must necessarily act. Let us look at it. Right now we are supporting Irish potatoes at 90 percent of parity, just as you propose in this wool bill to support wool at 100 percent of parity. During the last 6 months, so the Department of Agriculture reports, they have destroyed approximately 22,000,000 bushels of Irish potatoes as part of their effort to support the price to growers at 90 percent of parity. Do not forget that Irish potatoes are now under section 22. They are under it today. While we have supported Irish potatoes at 90 percent of parity, while we have dumped about 22,000,000 bushels we have imported into this country from Canada between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 bushels, but the President has not acted. The President has not asked the Tariff Commission to make an investigation. The President has not found that those imports of Irish potatoes from Canada have materially affected the support program. I submit that under the authority which the President has under section 22 there is no compulsion for him to impose an import fee or quotas on wool if wool is included in section 22. So I say that there must be complete discretion in the President of the United States, when we have been importing Irish potatoes into this country for the last 6 months and Irish potatoes are now covered by section 22.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman says there must be discretion in the President, I should like to know why it is that he objects so violently to providing in plain language that the President shall be free to exercise his sound discretion in this matter.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman has made no such proposal.

Mr. COOLEY. Those proposals have been made time and again since this controversy started. If the gentleman does not know now, if he is not conscious of the fact that he is undermining the reciprocal trade agreements, why is he not willing to accept this protective clause

which was in the bill of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

Mr. PACE. Because, as I told the gentleman before when the bill was on the floor, if the amendment which the gentleman offered in the House, receiving only 26 votes, was adopted, it would put Mr. Will Clayton in charge of the farm program of this country, and I do not intend to put it there if I can help it.

Let me say one more thing. There is only one big issue here, and that is whether you will accord wool the same protection as is accorded the other commodities I have read off to you. Then, there is one more issue here, and that may prove to be the biggest issue of all to me. That is whether the House will start the practice, as is proposed here when they urge us to accept the Senate bill, of supporting a commodity in the farm program up here at around parity and then dump it down there at any price that the market might bear in competition with foreign commodities. If you do that, your farm program is gone and the farmers of this country will have no protection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I have only 2 minutes to speak in opposition to this conference committee report.

The bill which was returned from the conference committee is, of course, identical with the bill that went out of the House except for one provision, which to my mind makes it very much worse than it was before it left here. That provision allows the President, and it is done, I believe, in order to contravene the possibility of this bill violating certain existing treaties, to use the import-quota system in order to prevent foreign wools coming into this country.

I would not mind that in the least if we did not have to import wool and were dealing with a commodity of which we had a surplus. But we are going to have to continue to import wool. The minute you begin using the import-quota system you open up regulatory bodies to the worst type of corruption that I can imagine. Any individual who receives a license to import, whether he be a manufacturer or an importer, is given a special privilege on which he can cash in. Every nation which is given permission to ship wool to this country—and there are some 20 nations shipping wool to this country—receives something of value for which they are willing to pay. You will completely demoralize every purchaser of wool in this country and I am speaking primarily because in my own section of the country there are dealers in wool and we have, roughly, 65 percent of the manufacturers of wool in the textile mills. They will not know where they stand from day to day if this bill is enacted.

I will also repeat what I have said previously when the bill came up here in the House. I think the price that has been set means that the Government is going to have to continue to purchase the entire commodity, and so-called free enterprise in dealing in that commodity will be gone.

I hope the conference committee report will not be accepted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that we have had to have this controversy over this report. The problem before us seems to me to be so simple and so just that it neither deserves the criticism we have had in the press nor the criticism we have had here on the floor of the House. It is just a very simple matter.

There is only one other country in the world which is concerned with this legislation, and that is the British Empire. For the last 3 years this Congress, by legislation, has excluded the local producer of wool from our local markets and has handed it over, principally to Australia and New Zealand, in its entirety.

We are now in a position of pleading with them to allow us to use our own market to sell this surplus of wool that we have acquired as a result of giving the market to them.

That is the whole question that is involved here. The question is very simple. If you farmers who are interested in the support program want to wreck it entirely, you just add the cost of this stock pile of wool to the Irish potatoes and you will certainly do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my good friend from the West [Mr. GRANGER] in saying he is sorry this controversy arose. It would not have been here if the House Committee on Agriculture and the House itself had followed the Senate bill which I, among others, thought was what the wool people wanted. There is no man in this House who is a greater friend of the wool people than I. I think my State probably produces more wool than any other State in the Union. I think this House bill and the conference report have gone too far. I think it is going to be desperately troublesome to the people of the United States, to our representatives abroad, who are trying to bring about these reciprocal trade agreements.

Let me say to you people who have farm surpluses, who have manufacturing surpluses, we must trade our surpluses to somebody for their surpluses or there will not be any trading. Money does not cross the ocean to balance trade between countries. It is goods for goods.

It has been said that Mr. Clayton came back to the United States. He did. He was negotiating in Geneva, getting along fine. He could have gotten along under the Senate bill, because there was nothing in there to scare the Australian, the New Zealander, or the South African, but when this bill was reported by the House Committee on Agriculture he came back here and said, "I am through in Geneva as long as this thing is pending in its

present form and as long as it has a chance to pass."

Cordell Hull, who could not have anything but a patriotic interest in this, wrote a letter to Secretary Marshall. I have only time to read one paragraph:

After more than a decade of successful operation under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and at a time when the principal trading nations of the world are prepared to follow our lead in carrying out a program of economic disarmament, it would be tragic, indeed, if any action of ours should endanger that program.

He says in his letter that this does endanger that program.

Another great ex-Secretary of State, Mr. Henry L. Stimson, in a letter to the Secretary of State, among other things, says this:

It is my considered opinion that the enactment of the House measure at any time would be most unwise.

Then listen to this statement:

It would amount to a repudiation of the whole structure of American economic policy developed in the Congress and in the State Department during the 15 years since Cordell Hull began his great work on trade agreements.

You have all seen the statement by Secretary of State Marshall. You have heard read into the RECORD letters by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], from Under Secretary of State, Mr. Clayton, who is deeply distressed, who knows that in the situation in which we find ourselves now as the greatest creditor nation in all the history of the world, with exports of from fifteen to sixteen billion dollars last year and with imports of less than eight billion, how long can our economy stand when goods must be traded for goods?

I say to you that in my opinion this House this afternoon—and I am going to give them an opportunity to do it—should by a vote express itself that the conferees should reconsider this bill, re-refer it to the conference committee in order that they may bring something in here that will be a support to the price of wool, do what the wool grower in the United States desires, which will keep him in business; but we must remember that out of the 1,000,000,000 pounds of wool that we manufacture in the United States of America only about 300,000,000 pounds is produced in the United States.

I want the support price. I want our wool growers to stay in business, but I do not want the great program of the United States getting together with the other parts of the world ruined, a program under which we can sell them our surplus if we will take some of theirs. I do not want that program done up, destroyed, thrown out, as I believe it will be under this bill.

They say the President has the power to do this, that, and in the other. It is a question of psychology with these people. That sword is hanging over their heads all the time, that the President may raise this tariff by 50 percent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I call attention to the fact that official figures show that our rate of exports during March was \$20,000,000,000 a year, whereas for the first quarter the figures show our imports are \$5,600,000,000. How long can that go on without a bust?

Mr. RAYBURN. Trade, commerce, agriculture, manufacturing—no business can stand a situation like that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it will mean the destruction of the full effectiveness of the Hull reciprocal trade agreements program. This bill should mean a lot to the people of America. It has great significance. From this fact that the Republican Party is responsible for its passage the commentators of the country and our people should realize that with a Republican victory in 1948—which looks very doubtful now—that reciprocal trade agreements will be scrapped.

If this bill becomes law it will have serious international economic repercussions.

The world will construe it that we are renewing the days of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

The old and dangerous journey of economic nationalism will be started again. From our own economic angle it is unwise.

Exports for March, including services, relief, and other shipments to occupied areas were at an annual rate of \$20,000,000,000. This is in accordance with the National City Bank's June letter.

This is more than we shipped abroad at the height of the war, even when lend-lease accounted for almost four-fifths of our total shipments.

It is vitally important for our own national economy that we sell from 10 to 15 percent of goods produced here abroad.

We know that from our experiences of the last depression.

Our exports play an important part in our employment?

Our imports for the first quarter of 1947 were at the rate of \$5,600,000,000 a year?

This is very disconcerting.

What does it mean? It means that foreign buyers are incurring a deficit in their dealings with us.

That cannot keep up long.

A continuance of that situation means a "bust."

It is apparent from actual business figures that gold and dollar positions of other countries are bad, and getting worse. Their reserves are on the downward trend, and their reserves are not healthy.

Even those countries—outside of the United States—who profited from the war are witnessing a dissipation of their gold and dollar reserves.

While the gift and dollar loans bring relief, that is only temporary, and partially artificial, unless the countries who buy from us develop a better balance of trade.



It is amazing how many persons ignore the indisputable fact that a country that buys must sell.

Even individuals must have a balance of trade with others.

Countries must.

No country can keep on buying more than it sells or exchanges in goods or services.

When the point is reached where a country cannot carry on — due to an unfavorable balance of trade—unnatural, unhealthy, artificial, expedient means are used in an attempt to meet the situation.

When one country starts—another follows—and the road of economic nationalism, such as followed the passage of the iniquitous Hawley-Smoot bill, is the result.

The important part of this bill is that for political reasons the domestic producer of wool is being sold down the river.

We all know a support-price bill until December 31, 1948, would be signed by the President.

And yet, this provision is inserted by the leadership of the Republican Party.

The domestic wool producers are being used in this preliminary step to the scrapping of the Hull reciprocal trade program.

The domestic wool producers are being used to bring about an acute international situation.

The Senate bill did not have the objectionable provisions. They were inserted by the Republican policy committee in the House.

I wonder if the domestic wool producers are going to let themselves be fooled by this exhibition of political hypocrisy.

To the people of the country this is a definite message that if the Republicans should by any chance win next year that the Hull reciprocal trade agreement program will be scrapped, and the world will again take a tailspin into the vicious journey of high trade barriers of economic nationalism.

In connection with the support-price provisions of this bill, to which there is no serious objection, the Member of the House who is entitled to primary credit is the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

While I cannot support this bill for the reasons I have stated, mainly because of the import provisions, I believe in giving credit where credit is due, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is entitled to that credit.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report, as I was to the original bill before us. The editorial from the New York Times set forth below points out clearly and succinctly the principal reasons for my opposition. Under leave granted, I cite this editorial and one from the Washington Star in support of the position

which I feel compelled to take in this matter:

[From the New York Times]

#### WOOL OVER THEIR EYES

In directing the President to increase the tariff or to impose quotas on wool, in order to carry out a price-support program, the House and Senate conferees, in their effort to increase the profits of a handful of wool growers in this country, have voted to accomplish the following things:

1. To hold up or increase the price of woolen clothing for all American consumers.

2. To alienate Australia, our gallant and vitally important war ally. Wool makes up 90 percent of the value of all Australian exports to this country. The effect of the conferees' action, if enacted into law, must be to push Australia and New Zealand more definitely into an empire-preference system, and away from freer trade with the United States.

3. To sabotage the reciprocal-trade program and the negotiations at Geneva with 16 other nations. To lead the world back toward protectionism, bilateralism, and economic isolationism.

4. To set an example in price control and in increased governmental barriers at a time when it is vitally necessary in the interests of this country to try to get Europe back to a system of freedom of trade and enterprise if world economic revival is to be made possible.

All this is being done by men who have repeatedly protested against governmental economic controls and declared their devotion to free enterprise.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

#### A RAD BILL

At a time when foreign nations are critically in need of dollars to buy things from us, nothing could seem more unrealistic than the Senate-House conference agreement on the tariff-boosting features of the wool support bill. Nor could anything be better calculated to wreck the American led international meeting at Geneva to work out a program for freer world trade.

As far as the dollar shortage abroad is concerned, this bill would have the effect of intensifying it. Wool represents about 95 percent of Australia's dutiable exports to us, and it is an important part of our trade with New Zealand and South Africa. In moving now to subject it to a tariff that could run 50 percent higher than the present high rate of 34 cents a pound, the Senate-House conferees have in effect moved to make more difficult than ever the effort of vital segments of the British Commonwealth to acquire the wherewithal they must have to pay for all the imports they need from us. This seems little short of folly, especially when related to the fact that one of the most serious problems of our time—in terms both of our own prosperity and the recovery of the world—is the lack of dollars in foreign lands.

From the long-range viewpoint, moreover, the effect of this measure on the objectives of the Geneva conference could be disheartening in the extreme. The United States has been seeking to spread the doctrine of reciprocal trade as one of the essentials of a sound peace—a doctrine aimed at a mutual lowering of friction-breeding tariff barriers in an ever-expanding area. Without such a program, as our Government leaders have said over and over again to the world, we can have only economic warfare, which in turn can sow the seeds of armed conflict. Wool is a symbol of our sincerity in this respect; if we now move to increase the duty on it, our fine words will have a hollow and mocking ring at Geneva, and other nations, fearing the beginning of a congressional assault on

our past reciprocity policy, will have good reason to accuse us of saying one thing and doing the exact opposite.

The wool-support bill can be attacked on other grounds besides these, but its implications as regards dollars and reciprocity are enough to make clear that it ought not to be enacted in its present form. If Congress as a whole adopts the Senate-House conference version, then the President will be justified in vetoing it. It simply cannot be reconciled with the role the United States must play in an economically sick world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times and one from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this conference report is exceedingly important to the economy of the West and to my State in particular.

Mr. Speaker, with all the hue and cry that has been raised about wool legislation, one might think that it contained some new and radical departure from established practices. A careful examination of the legislation reported by the conference committee shows that the opposite is true. There is only one provision in the bill that authorizes the President or his agents to do anything they are not already doing or have done with respect to wool and certain other commodities.

Most of the clamor in the press has concerned itself with the provision of this bill which permits the President, if he deems it wise and necessary, to raise the tariff as much as 50 percent of the value of imported wool or wool articles, or to establish import quotas. This action is not mandatory, but is optional if the President thinks that imports are imposing an unwarranted burden on our Treasury by their interference with the operation of the other provisions of the bill which set a price for wool and a domestic program to support the price. The President already has authority to raise duties on a long list of commodities, and he has exercised that authority. The price and support program has been in effect before this time for wool, and is in effect now for many other agriculture commodities. There is nothing new, no departure from long established precedent, in either of these provisions of the legislation.

The new provision is the authorization which is given the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of its wool holdings at a price less than parity in competition with other wools.

All of us have read and heard lengthy discussions of this legislation in which it has been said that the wool bill would break down our hopes of a profitable international trade by ending wool shipments from the British dominions. It is said that Australia has nothing to ship us but wool; that with passage of this

legislation she will no longer be able to ship wool to us, and the resulting breakdown in trade will hamper our efforts to build world peace. These are most irresponsible statements. From them one might come to think that it was our duty to buy all of the wool Australia and New Zealand can produce, and that failure to do so will mean disaster. Nothing could be more foolish.

In the first place, Australia and the other wool-producing countries will continue to ship wool to us, no matter what we do with our tariffs. At the present time we produce less than one-third of the wool we consume. It is not expected that we will ever produce more than one-half of our requirements. We will always need sizable imports of wool to supply the balance of our consumption. Wool will continue to come to this country, and we will continue to trade with Australia, regardless of the action taken on this legislation.

In the second place, for the same reasons, our imports of foreign wool will never be as large as the exporting countries might desire. Our ability to use foreign wool is strictly limited, and nothing that we do in this legislation will greatly alter the consumption of wool or the amount of foreign wool which we can use. In normal times we use about a half billion pounds of wool per year. Last year, because of pent-up wartime demand, we used nearly 1,000,000,000 pounds. We are not expected to maintain that rate of consumption this year.

Of course, we can, if we wish, let the wool industry of this country go out of existence, and we can become completely dependent upon foreign wool. The folly of such a procedure in the event of war is terrible to consider. During the last war we were very fortunate that we could keep open the supply lines to Australia, although for a time it appeared that they might be cut almost at will. I need only remind you that one of the principal causes of the defeat of the German drive at Stalingrad was the fact that Germany had not sufficient wool clothing to keep its army functioning in the severe Russian winter. Can we allow our domestic source of wool to disappear at a time when the next war, if there should be one, might well be fought across the Arctic regions?

It would be equally foolish so far as peacetime conditions are concerned to let this domestic industry wither. Some opponents of this measure are concerned with the possibility of a small increase in the price of woolen articles as a result of this bill. Whether there would be such an increase is highly problematical. It certainly would not be significant. But consider, if you will, the price we might have to pay for wool if all our wool came from abroad. Needless to say, the British Empire wool cartel is not an altruistic organization. Let me call to your mind the situation which existed when we had to depend wholly upon imports of rubber. The British and Dutch combined and pushed the price of rubber up out of all reason. It was only with the greatest of difficulty that we were able to extricate ourselves from that position. The same

thing can happen with the price of wool. We had a foretaste of it when production of American woolen garments was virtually strangled by OPA, and the imported woolen garments, shoddy as they were in many cases, sold at unbelievably high prices.

I would like to emphasize also that the price of wool has risen only 13 percent since September 15, 1941. Compare this, if you will, with other commodities. Under the plan envisioned in this bill, it is not intended to raise the price of wool above the present level, but to maintain it at that level so that the producer in this country may continue to exist. You have been given adequate statistical information to prove that the wool grower is no profiteer.

This bill means a very great deal to the State of Montana. The wool industry is one of the most important in our State. Montana is vast in area, but many thousands of acres are suitable primarily or solely for grazing livestock. If the livestock industry declines, our entire economy, not only in Montana but throughout the West, declines with it. The wool industry is by no means the insignificant little industry that is portrayed by the press, the State Department, and the others who are all too ready to sacrifice it for their own purposes. Already in Montana our sheep population has declined from about 5,000,000 to 2,000,000 head, and our wool production from 38,000,000 to 20,000,000 pounds. Our annual income from wool has varied from \$15,500,000 to \$3,000,000.

In this connection I would like to bring home to you the fact that you are doing away with much more than one western industry if you let the sheep business collapse. You are setting a precedent whereby jobs in the handling, processing, and manufacture of wool and woolen garments are taken from this country and transported to other countries. Such a precedent would bring disaster to a great many industries if it is carried to its logical conclusions.

The decline of the wool industry, the facts that have been brought out in our debate on this legislation, demonstrate better than anything I can call to mind the effect of the reciprocal trade agreements upon our economy. We have seen what can happen, not only to the producers of the raw material, but also to the workers in our cities who are engaged in the many steps of processing and manufacturing which turn the raw wool into the finished product, and deliver it to the ultimate consumer. The jobs of all these people, jobs that we can do efficiently in this country, will be exported if we follow the precedent advocated by those who would sacrifice our American wool industry to the interests of foreign producers.

The wool industry, if it is to survive, must have a firm program for the future. We require not only the actual support given in this legislation, but in addition the moral support which comes from the knowledge that we are interested in providing a helping hand to the industry. For these reasons, I hope that the con-

ference report on the wool bill will pass this House with a large majority today.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a great deal of shadow-boxing going on in connection with this bill, both on the floor and through the press of this country. This is not a tariff bill. The legislation does not fix any tariff rates one way or the other. In simple language all that the bill proposes is to place wool under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, with all other farm commodities, and to vest in the President discretionary power to impose import quotas or an import fee on wool in the event he deems such action advisable after finding that excessive importation of wool is interfering with a governmental program. This authority which he now possesses for all other commodities, is discretionary power in his hands.

The main issue involved in the controversial provisions of the wool bill is whether or not the President intends to exercise the authority conferred upon him by this bill. The Tariff Act of 1930 gives him the same authority which he has refused to exercise up to the present moment. Should the President find that the placing of a quota or import fee on wool is contrary to his foreign-trade policy, I am satisfied that he has no intention whatsoever of exercising the authority conferred upon him in section 22.

The gentleman from Georgia mentioned what the President had failed to do in the case of potatoes. Potatoes and other vegetables are amongst the products placed in section 22 more than 10 years ago by the Congress. At the present time there is a vital need for a quota or import fee on potatoes, but the President has elected not to exercise his discretionary power in this respect, and therefore, between four and five million bushels of potatoes have been imported from Canada during the past 7 months. Such a policy is being pursued by the President at a time when the Government has spent around \$85,000,000 to support the price of potatoes produced in this country. During the past 6 weeks representatives of the Department of Agriculture have been pouring kerosene on thousands of bushels of new potatoes in the southern States to destroy them in order to carry out the price-support program. This indefensible action has created a scarcity of potatoes which attracted imports of potatoes from Canada, but the President did not act or use the authority conferred upon him by section 22 to stop the injurious effect that imported potatoes were having on the Government's price-support program.

Since no additional authority is conferred upon the President by placing wool under section 22, we can only assume that he will treat wool in the same manner as he has potatoes, by not using his discretionary power to either place wool under a quota or import fee for the remainder of the 2-year period. It is clearly within his discretion to act as he sees fit.



Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry; my time is limited.

The letter to which our former Speaker referred as coming from the great Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, was written before this conference report was agreed to and presented to the House. The letter from Mr. Marshall came before the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. Clayton appeared before the conference committee and begged the committee not to include wool under section 22. He did not say that he came home from Geneva because of the House bill. As a matter of fact, he came home because he was not feeling well or for some other purpose. We might as well be honest about this matter. I do not think this is any secret. He said to the conference committee that he had been in the hospital and was having a rest. He stated further that he just got up out of his bed to come before the conference committee a day or so before we acted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman state to this House that Mr. Clayton stated to the conference committee he came home because he was sick? As a matter of fact he has stated every time that he came home on account of this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He said he was sick, and he did not state that the conference broke up on account of the wool bill. Now, let me explain about the conference at Geneva. The Geneva conference was not broken up as a result of the House wool bill, because even to the day when Mr. Clayton came before the conference committee, the conference was in session and the various committees are in session at Geneva negotiating trade agreements. When I asked Mr. Clayton if he proposed to cut the duty on wool he said he did not know because he had not discussed it with the President. When I asked him if he was going to cut the duty on butter, cheese, or any other item, he stated "that this was highly confidential" which he could not even discuss with the Members of Congress on the conference committee. It would be much better for Congress and the American people to learn the facts, rather than to be used as poker chips in an international poker game.

Mr. Clayton and his associates are dealing with the rights of the American people, and Members of Congress are entitled to receive honest answers to important questions dealing with such rights. It looks to me as though they are dealing away the rights of American workers and American farmers. What are we here for? We are here to legislate in the interests of the American people. If we are going to protect the economy of this country and the future of American workers and farmers, yes, even our American way of life, we had better find out what is being done at the Geneva Conference. Furthermore, it should be the duty of officials in the executive branch of the Government to be honest with the American people.

I believe that I have fully discussed the controversial provisions of the wool bill. The balance of the bill provides for the disposal of around 460,000,000 pounds of Government-owned wool, which was purchased by the Government during the war as a strategic material, in competition with imported wool. The British wool cartel or syndicate controls approximately 80 percent of all of the wool produced in the world. The reason that our Government has not been able to dispose of its domestic wool is due to the fact that the British syndicate has undersold foreign wool in our domestic market at a price below parity. The bill places the Government in a position to dispose of its wool in competition with British wool, and the Treasury will stand the loss. This loss will no doubt exceed \$50,000,000, and it is not a subsidy to wool growers, because the Government is the owner of the wool. The bill also proposes the continuation of the present price support program for wool for 1947 and 1948 in accordance with the provisions of the Steagall amendment which assures a support price for all farm products until December 31, 1948.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much this legislation has resulted in all of this controversy that is so needless. I cannot help but wonder where Mr. Cordell Hull was when this present administration raised the duty by 50 percent, under section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, on crabs and crab meat. I wonder where he was when they put an embargo on tobacco seed going out of this country. I wonder what he was doing when the embargo was placed on wheat imports, and what he was thinking when the first embargo was placed on cotton. I wonder what he was thinking when millions of dollars were used as an export subsidy for cotton and other crops. He was Secretary of State at the time. He gave no vocal or written protest at the time. Why his sudden interest in wool? How does Mr. Clayton explain that to the world? Here is an administration that went so far as to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed, and there are other commodities in the same category. Now, all at once the poor little sheep is the cause of all the disturbances there are in this whole wide world. If the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] had not had the patience of Job, he would have thrown this wool proposition and the wool bill out of the window. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] has worked on this problem for 2 years. The wool is not asking any more consideration than is accorded a dozen other commodities, as was brought out here this afternoon.

There is one thing I would like to say to the distinguished minority leader, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas: We cannot put someone in the sheep business and take him out of the sheep business at the same time. We have to do one or the other. And if you want to get higher meat prices you just vote

against this conference report. You have about one-third of the sheep industry liquidated now. Go ahead and liquidate the other two-thirds and then keep right on hollering about the price of meat. That is one of the fundamental reasons we are in trouble today with meat in this country. We have been catering too much to the politicians. We have not given the livestock industry of the country the consideration it is entitled to. Then we have to listen to the New Deal propaganda about soil conservation, even at this hour when we are determining whether or not to liquidate the sheep industry. If they had not paid so much attention to some of these experts from the Wharton Schools of Finance and a few more in that position, we would not be in the mess we are in today so far as food is concerned.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would just like to call the attention of the Members to the fact that this matter has been under consideration in both Houses of the Congress for a long time. It is my understanding that both Committees of Agriculture gave the matter long and careful consideration, listening to all who wanted to be heard. The measure has been passed by both Houses, and it is now out of the committee of conference, after careful consideration of that body. It is my view that this legislation should be enacted, and I trust that the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE WOOL BILL SHOULD BE ADOPTED BY THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this wool bill some people, including some metropolitan newspapers, should obtain some facts and not deal so much in fiction. The conference report is preferable to the bill passed by the House.

First. The wool bill as passed by the House did not give the President any powers that he does not already have. President Roosevelt used these powers found in section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, when on August 22, 1941, he increased the duty on crab meat and crab-meat products. This proclamation can be found on page 55 of the United States Tariff Committee Report No. 147. After the bad things the New Deal has said about the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, it is pleasant to note that they made use of it when they so desired.

Second. The conference report, my colleagues, does not give the President any power that he does not already have under section 22 of the AAA Act so far as a half dozen other agricultural commodities have at this very hour. In other words wool is added to the list of crops or products that have been included in this preferred list, which are cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. You ask if any of these crops have been extended preferential consideration under this section 22? The answer is "Yes." An embargo was put on wheat imports and two embargoes have been placed on cotton imports, the last having been put into effect February

1, 1947. The reason given for placing this embargo on wheat and cotton was that the imports of these crops were disrupting the domestic farm program for these "special privilege" crops, wheat and cotton.

Third. This brings up then the question of what would be the procedure if the peanut growers are compelled to take a reduction in duty of from 7 to 3½ cents per pound duty. The 7 cents per pound duty is more than the crop brought in the marketplace for 25 years before the war. Under the present situation peanuts being under section 22 would be protected without any special legislative consideration by the Congress. I am sure you realize that something was disturbing farm prices in 1939 when the whole New Deal agricultural program bogged down. In August 1939 the farmer received as low as 54 cents a bushel for wheat when 27 cents per bushel was being paid for an export subsidy on wheat and when cotton was only 8.6 cents per pound. The remedy used to correct this situation was: The Smoot-Hawley import duties in effect did not prevent imports, and the New Deal just placed an embargo on imports right on top of the Smoot-Hawley duty and called it reciprocity and a good-neighbor policy. While this set-up has only been used for cotton and wheat, the other four agricultural products on the "preferred" list could be protected, and wool wishes to be included in the same group.

Fourth. Do you believe in special privileges? If a half dozen agricultural commodities are under section 22, why should not all crops or farm products have equal consideration, and why is it so sinful to add wool to the list under section 22? I wish some Member would answer this question. In fact, if wool had been included and had had consideration under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act it would not be necessary to even give legislative consideration to wool at this time.

Fifth. Although tobacco already is under section 22, has this section been used to give added protection to this product? The answer is "No." Tobacco, although it has been placed in the preferred class under section 22, has had other ingenious legislative devices that give the product more protection than was offered in the much criticized Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. The fact is a wall higher than the Washington Monument has been placed around this commodity. What are these devices? First, the high duties under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act were maintained. In addition the import quota has been put into effect for certain kinds of tobacco. Some of the crop also enjoyed an export subsidy. But these were not the real special privileges. The real special privilege for tobacco was when the exportation of tobacco seed was prohibited and prevented. Why was this done? The Secretary of Agriculture's office in a letter to me states it was done to keep China and other countries from raising tobacco and interfering with United States exports. This is an example of the hypocrisy of the reciprocal trade program and the good neighbor policy. Countries like China may not protest this discrimination when they are operating

on United States loans, but when and if repayment time comes, they may wish to send tobacco instead of dollars. Another scheme or special privilege is the "Fascist" scheme of tying tobacco acreage to the land or farm. This scheme has made lands with tobacco allotments sell away out of proportion to its real value and prevents new farmers from raising and marketing their crops. This is special privilege to the nth degree.

Sixth. If the wool bill is defeated and the "Voice" bill passed, the people of other lands who are to be provided \$10 per day for traveling on the "Cook's Tours" will not see sheep on the prairies of South Dakota, Montana, Texas, and Wyoming, but will have to find them on exhibit in the zoos like the buffaloes at the present time. That is exactly what you will have if the sheep business is liquidated.

Seventh. The State Department propagandists have deceived the American people about reciprocity long enough. The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act might have been criticized but the New Deal added insult upon injury and has added additional trade barriers although they have been most vocal as well as deceitful in their propaganda about them. Some universities will not even distribute State Department propaganda because it is not factual.

Eighth. Surely the NAM follows along with these propagandists. Manufacturers want plenty of protection for manufactured products but little or none on raw material. Their testimony before the Ways and Means Committee is conclusive proof of this statement.

#### A VOTE AGAINST THE CONFERENCE REPORT

First. A vote against the conference report is a vote for higher meat prices in the United States. Do you wish to go on record for higher prices at this time? Already one-third of the flocks of sheep in this country have been liquidated. If you vote against this conference report you are taking the position that you wish to liquidate the sheep industry of this country completely and put yourself on record to do so.

Second. A vote against this conference report is a vote not only against the American sheep farmer, but also a vote against providing a domestic supply of strategic material.

Third. A vote against this conference report is a vote for special privileges for certain crops and a vote to have special privileges for the few.

Fourth. A vote against this conference report is a vote to let the State Department dominate the agricultural economy of this country.

Fifth. A vote against this conference report is a vote to support a set-up to cooperate with a foreign-wool cartel or monopoly that does not dare set up shop within the United States.

Sixth. A vote against this conference report then aligns you definitely and ties you right up with the group of monopoly and cartel advocates.

Seventh. A vote against this conference report makes you a party to wrecking the sheep industry of our country.

Eighth. A vote against this conference report places the American wool consumer in the clutches of a foreign-wool monopoly.

#### A VOTE FOR THE CONFERENCE REPORT

First. A vote for this conference report is a vote to maintain the sheep industry of the United States.

Second. A vote for this conference report is a vote to produce strategic material—wool—and not add wool to the long list of deficit commodities.

Third. A vote for this conference report is a vote to prevent foreign monopolies from dictating to the American consumer how much he must pay for woolen products.

Fourth. A vote for this conference report is a vote to fulfill wartime commitments made to the American sheep men.

Fifth. A vote for this conference report is a vote to indicate that you represent your people without dictation from the State Department or any other administrative branch of the Government.

Sixth. A vote for this conference report indicates that you are for a bill sent to the Congress by a member of the President's cabinet, the Secretary of Agriculture.

Seventh. A vote for this conference report indicates that you are voting to include wool with a half dozen other farm commodities that have exactly the same legislative consideration.

Eighth. A vote for this conference report is a vote to produce more meat as well as wool in the United States and make the United States more self-sufficient so far as meat supplies are concerned.

The consideration of this wool bill indicates the position that the Congress is going to take in regard to the general support price program. Some agricultural commodities have not been supported in accordance with the law. I realize that only 20,000,000 people out of the total of 140,000,000 people in the United States live on farms and I realize how difficult it is to secure economic justice for the rural people.

The League of Women Voters have been deceived far too long. The New Deal embargoes added to the Smoot-Hawley duties have shown the deception of the New Deal reciprocity program.

The President is now asking for legislation to control exports. If the President disapproves of legislation to control imports when the legislation only provides legislation already provided other agricultural products, how or why should he expect a continuation of his powers to control exports?

United States wool imports  
[Dutiable wool]

Year	Actual weight	Clean content	Value
	Millions of pounds	Millions of pounds	Millions of dollars
1942.....	525.8	306.9	150.3
1943.....	624.6	380.8	191.0
1944.....	529.7	332.5	158.2
1945.....	657.1	406.1	201.1
1946 <sup>1</sup> .....	807.5	468.9	228.5

<sup>1</sup> Duty collected for the year of 1946 was \$147,200,000.

NOTE.—See total unmanufactured wool imports on next table.

U. S. Tariff Commission June 16, 1947.



Note that 30 percent of this \$147,200,000 provides forty-four millions for section 32 funds. Forty millions were provided in the agricultural appropriation bill for use in 1947 under section 32. These section 32 funds are being used to find new uses for cotton. The new uses have been overshadowed by a surplus cotton racket to provide cheaper insulating material and to provide a \$1.20 subsidy per automobile manufactured.

*United States wool imports*  
(Total unmanufactured wool)

Year	Actual weight	Clean content	Value
	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	
1942.....	1,089,631,780	622,374,267	\$311,337,735
1943.....	963,269,618	569,804,144	295,703,310
1944.....	636,544,352	410,233,944	186,234,078
1945.....	819,905,493	517,269,146	241,173,644
1946.....	1,062,701,937	650,057,334	299,725,993

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, in the minds of some people it is high treason to protect agriculture and the American farmer. It is about time we are protecting the American wool industry or there will not be any such industry to protect in the years to come. Our sheep industry is now being reduced at the rate of approximately 4,000,000 head a year. Statistics show that in 1943 we had approximately 49,000,000 head; 45,000,000 in 1944, 41,000,000 in 1945; 37,000,000 in 1946 and 32,000,000 in 1947. Thus we have had a reduction of approximately 17,000,000 head in the past 5 years. At this rate it is very apparent that in about 10 years from now there will be very few sheep left in this country. Perhaps we should take time to stop, look, and listen before it is too late. The conference report should be adopted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that this conference report will be adopted. The tariff issue has been stressed far out of proportion to its importance as it applies to this measure. I am one of those who has confidence that, before he invokes the provisions of section 22 in defense of the wool program, the President of the United States will use good, sound judgment and discretion. With respect to the making of section 22 of the AAA law apply to wool, we seek only to apply to wool the same identical treatment that for the past 12 years has been accorded to some 20 or 30 agricultural products.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. RAYBURN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAYBURN moves to recommit the conference report on the bill S. 814 to the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 166, nays 191, not voting 72, as follows:

(Roll No. 81)

YEAS—166

Albert	Gore	Norton
Andrews, Ala.	Gorski	O'Brien
Andrews, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Auchincloss	Gregory	Patterson
Bakewell	Hale	Peden
Bates, Ky.	Hardy	Peterson
Bates, Mass.	Harris	Pickett
Battle	Harrison	Plumley
Beckworth	Hart	Poage
Blatnik	Havener	Potts
Bloom	Hays	Price, Fla.
Bonner	Heffernan	Price, Ill.
Brooks	Hendricks	Priest
Bryson	Herter	Rabin
Buchanan	Heseltun	Rains
Buck	Hollifield	Ramey
Buckley	Huber	Rankin
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Wash.	Rayburn
Burke	Jarman	Rayfield
Byrne, N. Y.	Javits	Redden
Canfield	Johnson, Okla.	Richards
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Riley
Carroll	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Case, N. J.	Judd	Rogers, Fla.
Celler	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Mass.
Chadwick	Kean	Rooney
Church	Keating	Sabath
Clason	Kee	Sadlak
Colmer	Keogh	Sedowski
Cooley	Kerr	Sasser
Cooper	King	Scott,
Corbett	Kirwan	Hugh D. Jr.
Cotton	Klein	Seely-Brown
Courtney	Lane	Sheppard
Cox	Lanham	Sikes
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Smathers
Deane	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Delaney	Lusk	Smith, Va.
Devitt	Lyle	Spence
Dingell	Lynch	Stigler
Donohue	McConnell	Sundstrom
Doughton	McCormack	Taylor
Douglas	McMillan, S. C.	Thomas, N. J.
Durham	MacKinnon	Thomas, Tex.
Eberhart	Madden	Thomason
Evins	Manasco	Tollefson
Fallon	Marcantonio	Towe
Felghan	Meade, Md.	Trimble
Fogarty	Merrow	Walter
Folger	Miller, Calif.	Whittington
Foote	Miller, Conn.	Wigglesworth
Forand	Mills	Wilson, Tex.
Fulton	Monroney	Wolverton
Gary	Morgan	Wood
Goodwin	Morris	Zimmerman
Gordon	Morton	

NAYS—191

Abernethy	Case, S. Dak.	Fenton
Allen, Calif.	Chenoweth	Fernandez
Allen, Ill.	Chipherfield	Fisher
Allen, La.	Clevenger	Flannagan
Almond	Clippinger	Fletcher
Andersen,	Coffin	Gathings
H. Carl	Cole, Kans.	Gavin
Anderson, Calif.	Cole, Mo.	Gearhart
Andresen,	Cole, N. Y.	Gillette
August H.	Cravens	Gillie
Angell	Crawford	Goff
Arends	Crow	Gossett
Arnold	Cunningham	Graham
Banta	Curtis	Granger
Barrett	Dague	Grant, Ind.
Beall	Davis, Ga.	Griffiths
Bender	Davis, Wis.	Gross
Bennett, Mich.	Dawson, Utah	Gwynne, Iowa
Bennett, Mo.	D'Ewart	Hagen
Blackney	Dirksen	Hall,
Bradley	Dolliver	Leonard W.
Bramblett	Domengeaux	Halleck
Brehm	Dondero	Harless, Ariz.
Brophy	Dorn	Harness, Ind.
Brown, Ga.	Drewry	Hedrick
Brown, Ohio	Elliott	Hess
Buffett	Ellis	Hill
Burleson	Elston	Hinshaw
Byrnes, Wis.	Engel, Mich.	Hobbs
Camp	Engle, Calif.	Hoeven
Carson	Fellows	Holmes

Hope	Martin, Iowa	Rohrbough
Horan	Mason	Ross
Howell	Meyer	Russell
Hull	Michener	Sanborn
Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Md.	Schwabe, Mo.
Jenison	Miller, Nebr.	Schwabe, Okla.
Jenkins, Ohio	Mitchell	Scott, Hardie
Jennings	Morrison	Scribner
Jensen	Muhlenberg	Short
Johnson, Calif.	Mundt	Simpson, Ill.
Johnson, Ill.	Murdock	Simpson, Pa.
Johnson, Ind.	Murray, Tenn.	Smith, Kans.
Jones, Ohio	Murray, Wis.	Smith, Wis.
Jonkman	Nixon	Snyder
Keefe	Norblad	Springer
Kilday	O'Hara	Stefan
Kunkel	O'Konski	Stevenson
Landis	Owens	Stratton
Larcade	Pace	Taber
Latham	Passman	Talle
Lea	Phillips, Calif.	Teague
LeCompte	Phillips, Tenn.	Tibbott
Lemke	Ploeser	Twyman
Lewis	Poulson	Vail
Love	Preston	Van Zandt
McCowan	Reed, Ill.	Vorsy
McDonough	Reed, N. Y.	Vursell
McGarvey	Rees	Weichel
McGregor	Reeves	Wheeler
McMillen, Ill.	Riehlman	Whitten
Macy	Rizley	Wilson, Ind.
Mahon	Robertson	Woodruff
Mansfield,	Robson	Worley
Mont.	Rockwell	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—72

Barden	Gwinn, N. Y.	Meade, Ky.
Beil	Hall,	Nodar
Bishop	Edwin Arthur	Norrell
Bland	Hand	Patman
Boggs, Del.	Hartley	Pfeifer
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Philbin
Bolton	Hoffman	Powell
Boykin	Jenkins, Pa.	Rich
Busbey	Jones, N. C.	St. George
Butler	Jones, Wash.	Sarbacher
Chapman	Kearney	Scoblick
Chelf	Kearns	Shafer
Clark	Kefauver	Smith, Ohio
Clements	Kelley	Somers
Combs	Kennedy	Stanley
Coudert	Kersten, Wis.	Stockman
Crosser	Kilburn	Vinson
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Wadsworth
Eaton	LeFevre	Welch
Ellsworth	Lucas	West
Elsaesser	McDowell	Williams
Fuller	McMahon	Winstead
Gallagher	Maloney	Wolcott
Gamble	Mansfield, Tex.	
Gifford	Mathews	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. LeFevre against.

Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Busbey against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Gwinn of New York against.

Mr. McDowell for, with Mr. Bishop against.

Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Kelley.

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Winstead.

Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Gamble with Mr. Mansfield of Texas.

Mr. Nodar with Mr. Combs.

Mr. Mathews with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Kearney with Mr. Norrell.

Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Lucas.

Mr. Boggs of Delaware with Mr. Chelf.

Mr. Wolcott with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Coudert with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Patman.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Clark.

Mr. McMahon with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. Knutson with Mr. Somers.

Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. West.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Crosser.

Mr. Rich with Mr. Stanley.

Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Shafer with Mr. Bland.

Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Clements.

Mr. Butler with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. GEARHART, Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. COLE of Kansas changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. SMITH of Maine changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an excerpt from the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs may be permitted to sit tomorrow and Wednesday during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today following any special orders heretofore entered. I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a news editorial.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article on postage rates.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and in each to include some printed material.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on the bill H. R. 3342, the unfinished business before the House, and to include some extraneous material.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ELLIS, from June 27 to July 2, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### BUYING AGENCIES USE TAX MONEY TO INFLATE HOUSEWIFE'S PRICES BY NOT UTILIZING SURPLUS CANNED FOODS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of our colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently in regard to the problem of surplus canned goods in the United States which are not being utilized by our Government agencies in our relief and other programs, has attracted Nation-wide attention. Failure of our Government to utilize these hundreds of millions of dollars of canned foods, much of which is in the hands of the packers will affect the economy of the country, and our farmers will suffer by reduced prices when new crops are harvested. With warehouses flooded throughout the country there will be no demand for these canned foods and as a consequence the prices will go down to almost nothing.

Many millions of dollars have been appropriated by the Federal Government for foodstuff to send to Europe and other war areas. Most of these appropriations in the past have specified that cereal grains only could be bought for export, in spite of the fact that the Government has had to buy and, in many cases, destroy, one of the largest potato crops ever produced in this country.

The results have been that grain prices have skyrocketed while other agricultural products have had to battle a glutted market, and the price of bread is twice its prewar price. Of course, we are in favor of buying grains as far as possible, however. Other millions of dollars have had to be spent for vitamin pills to make up the deficiency found in grain, so that the starving multitudes would not starve while eating.

The canners of America are faced with the largest carry-over in history of many foods, such as sweetpotatoes, that are both high in food value and also contain more than the necessary amount of vitamins, but to date the officials in Washington merely shrug and say that they will continue to buy grain.

As of April 1, 1947, which is the beginning of the year as far as canners are concerned, there were 192,195,000 cases of canned goods in the hands of United States packers and distributors—2,465,000 cases of this were canned sweetpotatoes.

Mr. Speaker, sweetpotatoes is only one of the foods that could be utilized in our relief programs, and while this is one of the principal products of my district, which produces more sweetpotatoes than any other section of the country—sweetpotatoes are grown all the way from New Jersey to California in the coastal States—and this is only one of the canned foods which could be utilized which is rich in vitamin content. Sweetpotatoes are rich in vitamin content and are delicious and delectable and require no additions in preparation for consumption,

whereas grains require many other scarce and costly products to be added before they can be consumed.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include a table showing the food and vitamin values per pound of Puerto Rican sweetpotatoes—which is the variety grown in the United States—as follows:

*Food and vitamin values per pound of Puerto Rican sweetpotatoes*

	Canned	Fresh
Calories.....	720	667
Carbohydrates.....grams.....	174	127
Protein.....do.....	3.48	8
Fat.....do.....	1.05	3
Calcium.....do.....	54.3	159
Iron.....do.....	3.9	3.2
Vitamin C (ascorbic acid).....milligrams.....	95.2	113
Vitamin B-1 (thiamin).....do.....	.113	.45
Vitamin B-2 (riboflavin).....do.....	.127	.32
Niacin.....do.....	2.01	5.9
Carotene.....do.....	12.5	24.5
Phosphorus.....do.....	10	222

Canned analysis from Quartermaster, Chicago, Ill.; fresh from National Research Council.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include at this point statistics in terms of money, the value of the United States and Louisiana sweetpotato crop as follows:

Value of production multiplied by season average price:	
United States.....	\$146,107,000
Louisiana.....	17,496,000
Value of sales—estimate of quantities sold:	
United States.....	\$64,169,000
Louisiana.....	10,627,000

Figures published by the USDA Crop Reporting Board in a publication entitled "The Farm Production Farm Disposition and Value of Principal Crops, 1945-46" for May 1947.

Mr. Speaker, of the total United States sweetpotato crop about 5,000,000 cases were canned in the 1945-46 season and Louisiana canners packed about 1,250,000 cases of last year's crop. Production of sweetpotatoes was increased in the United States along with other food crops at the request of the Department of Agriculture during and after the war, and surpluses have accumulated, hence, I feel, that the Department of Agriculture and the Government have an obligation in the disposition of these foods, otherwise, millions of dollars will be lost by our people.

At present, wholesalers are selling to retailers at prices that are about 50 percent of November 1946 wholesale prices, and much cheaper than the packers can replace the items in their own warehouses.

The prospects of any permanent long-range benefit from the hundreds of millions of dollars that are being wasted in feeding strategic areas are nil under our present Pollyanna policy. Small countries of Europe and Asia have learned, through the centuries, that they must be agreeable to their powerful neighbors—and force alone is the determining factor. We have excellent examples of this policy in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and now Hungary.

It is up to our Representatives and Senators in Washington to see that this money is spread more evenly over the Nation. By insisting that the export agencies buy surplus canned foods, our Congressmen and Senators can do much to relieve the glutted market and insure fair prices to the farmers for the 1947



crops, without the aid of a Production and Marketing Administration buying program aimed at destroying foodstuffs.

Most of our politicians still remember the little pigs—let us remind them again.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland, Representative MILLER, and myself plan to call a meeting of our colleagues from the States which produce canned foods for the purpose of ascertaining if there is a way to have our Government agencies purchase a part of this valuable and desirable food for relief purposes, as well as to feed our armies of occupation in Japan and Europe, and we ask that all interested Members of Congress attend this meeting when announced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MUNDT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### AIR-LINE CRASHES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, air crashes in the United States in the past 16 days have taken 145 lives. It is a grim and awful thing to contemplate that these crashes could have been prevented by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Mr. Speaker, many hundreds of other innocent victims will be added to those already dead unless this House demands the necessary action from the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The husband of my secretary, coming home to a family reunion after being in the field at work for the past 6 weeks, died in the crash of the Capital air liner in the Blue Ridge Mountains on Friday. The young daughter of one of my closest friends was on her way to Washington and died in that crash. In the past two and a half weeks more than a score of Clevelanders have been killed in commercial air line crashes.

Mr. Speaker, the time is long past for this House to take action and I propose that we take action. Today I am introducing a joint resolution which instructs the Civil Aeronautics Administration to require immediately the installation of radar altimeter equipment in all licensed commercial aircraft. This joint resolution also instructs the Civil Aeronautics Administration to require immediately the installation of ground control approach equipment at all airports from which commercial aircraft are licensed to operate. My resolution, Mr. Speaker, also requires that the Civil Aeronautics Administration immediately order the establishment of omnidirectional system of radio beams on all commercial airways. In addition, the resolution calls for a prompt report from the Civil Aeronautics Administration on their safety regulation service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House take prompt action on this resolution. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has the authority and the power to prevent the kind of disasters that have taken place in the last 2 weeks. It has an obligation to use that power. The House should demand that it use that power.

Just a moment ago I received a telegram from the father of a beautiful 18-

year-old girl who was killed in the latest crash here in Virginia:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, June 16, 1947.

Congressman GEORGE H. BENDER:

GEORGE, suggest all air lines keep track of all planes in the air by ground-controlled radar along route similar to Army-Navy ground-controlled radar systems. If planes are all grounded suggest regular inspection service similar to existing steamship regulations.

HARRY W. HOSFORD.

Here is a father, even though he lost his youngest child in this disaster, who is considerate of the children of others who may experience a similar fate. He asks that something be done rather than just appoint committees. The President has appointed the committee, but he appointed the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which, in my opinion, is responsible for this condition. If you are going to have any kind of a commission to report or any kind of a committee, it should be a committee of this House.

Mr. Speaker, Howard Hughes has voluntarily begun the installation of radar altimeter equipment in all the TWA planes. It is his statement that four of the six recent airplane disasters could have been prevented if the planes had been equipped with proper radar altimeter equipment. The Army Air Forces employed this equipment throughout the war. There is no reason whatsoever that this equipment cannot be installed. I am confident that the great electrical manufacturing industry would give priority to the manufacturing of such equipment. Why, Mr. Speaker, does not the Civil Aeronautics Administration act?

Mr. Speaker, throughout the war the Army employed ground-control approach equipment. It has been said that the installation of such equipment at airports would be expensive. This consideration dwindles into insignificance when we realize that human lives are at stake, that the airplane industry is a great and growing one, and before all else must guarantee the safety of its passengers. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has the authority. It can refuse to license the operation of commercial aircraft from any field which does not have such equipment. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has the authority; let the Civil Aeronautics Administration act.

Mr. Speaker, there were several plane crashes in southwest Virginia during the present year in which the pilots were blown off their radio beam and were lost. These crashes occurred at night. The investigators of these crashes stated that if the proper radio directional equipment, namely, the omnidirectional system, or radio beams, had been in use, these plane crashes could have been averted.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has the power to require the installation of this improved system. Why, Mr. Speaker, does not the Civil Aeronautics Administration take action?

More than 50 people, Mr. Speaker, lost their lives in the Eastern Air Lines crash in Maryland on May 30. The report on that air crash indicated that

some machinist had unwittingly filed a connecting bolt when he should not have done so. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is responsible for the adequacy of maintenance work. I myself was on a plane 2 days ago, looked out of the window and noticed four screws on the cowl of the port engine bouncing up and down. At our first landing I suggested to the ground crew that they get a screwdriver and go up and screw those loose cowl screws into their proper places. Mr. Speaker, the air lines have expanded rapidly; they have introduced new equipment but they have failed to keep their ground maintenance work up to proper standards. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that the Civil Aeronautics Administration cracked down on ground-crew maintenance work.

Mr. Speaker, the pilot of the American Airliner which crashed at LaGuardia Airfield on May 29 stated that he could have used a longer runway but that the longer runway had undulations and many bumps in it and, in his opinion, should not be used. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Administration is responsible for the checking of airport conditions. It is past time, Mr. Speaker, for the Civil Aeronautics Administration to crack down on airports whose maintenance is in this sloppy condition. Mr. Speaker, when we remember that this experienced pilot chose to take a shorter runway rather than one which he knew to be of adequate length because the longer runway was in bad condition, when we remember that 40 people lost their lives because that runway was in such shape that the pilot chose to use another one—a shorter one—it fills me personally with intense rage. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has got to be made to face its responsibilities. If the Truman administration is unable to get competent people to run the Civil Aeronautics Administration or if the Truman administration thinks that the establishment of investigating committees meets the needs of the present situation, then something is terribly wrong.

In the past 10 years the aircraft industry and the airplane industry have received more aid from the Federal Government than any other industry probably in American history, with the exception of railroads. The Government has financed airports throughout the country. The Government has financed aircraft research and development work. An entire generation of Americans has been sold by the Government during the war on the romance and glamor of the aviation industry. During the war the Government trained 2,000,000 young men either as pilots, mechanics, ground crew, or service personnel. Equipment has been sold to the air lines. In every possible way the Government has assisted the aviation industry, actually with what amounts to billions of dollars either in terms of publicity, research, training of the labor supply, building of airports, transfer of equipment. There is no industry in the country today that has had so many of the things necessary to it underwritten by the Government or pro-

vided by the Government and probably there is no industry in the country which will make as much money or has such a tremendous future before it.

It is absolutely imperative that the Government exercise its authority and guarantee safety insofar as this is humanly possible within the aviation industry.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has the authority required. The Congress must demand that the Civil Aeronautics Administration act. There is no reason why a procrastinating and dilatory Civil Aeronautics Administration should lead to the death of a single person more in an unnecessary aircraft disaster.

I trust that the House will give prompt consideration to the joint resolution which I herewith read and introduce:

Joint resolution to provide for the installation of radar and other safety equipment in commercial aircraft and airfields, and for other purposes

*Resolved*, That the Civil Aeronautics Administration is authorized and directed to order the immediate installation of—

(1) radar-altimeter equipment in all commercial aircraft licensed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

(2) ground-control approach equipment in all airfields from which such commercial aircraft are permitted to operate; and

(3) omnidirectional systems of radio beams on all commercial airways.

Sec. 2. The Civil Aeronautics Administration shall, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, submit to the Congress a complete report on the status of the safety-regulation service of the Civil Aeronautics Administration with particular reference to the maintenance work of commercial air lines and the condition of airports.

I want to say this to you: Another beautiful girl of my acquaintance, a young girl who was to be married today, was buried in her wedding gown last week; a girl, whose father is one of my very, very best friends, died, was roasted to death on that plane.

You can understand, Mr. Speaker, why I am keeping you here tonight. Over 20 persons from Cleveland have died in the past two and a half weeks as a result of the carelessness of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, people with many of whom I have been closely associated.

I went to a funeral parlor today with my secretary to view the remains of her husband, a fine young man who was killed in Virginia last Friday night. I tell you, when you go through this experience, as I have during these last 2 weeks, you can appreciate why I am as deeply concerned about this thing as I am.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 17, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

788. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed

provision pertaining to existing appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 and supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$223,500 for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 323); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

789. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$1,490,000 for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 324); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

790. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to designate the Air University Library, Army Air Forces, as a public depository for Government publications; to the Committee on House Administration.

791. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics for the calendar year ended December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

792. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of the Federal Trade Commission, entitled "The Sulfur Industry and International Cartels" (H. Doc. No. 325); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

793. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$710,660 for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 326); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

794. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$73,361,400 for the Department of State to enable United States participation in the International Refugee Organization (H. Doc. No. 327); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

795. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 for completing the liquidation of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, in the amount of \$90,000 (H. Doc. No. 328); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Committee on Un-American Activities submits a report on Southern Conference for Human Welfare; without amendment (Rept. No. 592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 248. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 3839, a bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 593). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3818. A bill to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 3850. A bill to declare certain rights of citizens of the United States, and for the better assurance of the protection of such citizens and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKNEY:

H. R. 3851. A bill to provide additional inducements to physicians and surgeons to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3852. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3853. A bill to repeal provisions of certain acts of Congress relating to free tuition for nonresidents in the public schools of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 3854. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Boise Barracks Military Reservation, Boise, Idaho, to the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3855. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 3856. A bill relating to migratory farm labor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3857. A bill to authorize the parishes and congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia to establish bylaws governing the election of their vestrymen; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PICKETT (by request):

H. R. 3858. A bill to provide retirement annuities for certain former rural letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3859. A bill to authorize the leasing of salmon-trap sites in Alaskan coastal waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 3860. A bill to amend sections 3108 and 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 3861. A bill to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 3862. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 3863. A bill to amend section 3673 of the Internal Revenue Code to facilitate the procuring of certificates releasing tax liens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 3864. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act with respect to contribution rates after termination of military service; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3865. A bill to exempt the personal property of veterans' organizations incorporated by acts of Congress from taxation by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3866. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to recreation facilities and activities operated or conducted by the Federal Government, the several State governments, or political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution to provide for the installation of radar and other safety equipment in commercial aircraft and airfields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 247. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate the national housing shortage; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. Res. 249. Resolution making H. R. 3488, a bill to declare certain rights of citizens of the United States, and for the better assurance of the protection of such citizens and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to eliminate the taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3867. A bill for the relief of Hal W. Cline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 3868. A bill for the relief of Morris Gordon, Dorothy Gordon, Leo Gordon, and Louis H. Oppenheim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3869. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Porter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

633. By Mr. BENDER: Petition of the City Council of Chicago, petitioning the President to veto the Hartley-Taft bill, and in the event of a Presidential veto that the Senators and Members of Congress from Illinois vote to sustain the veto; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

634. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to eliminate the taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

635. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of a group of residents of Beloit, Wis., and vicinity, urging veto of the Hartley-Taft labor

bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

636. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the New York State Association of Retail Meat Dealers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to exportation of meat to foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

637. Also, petition of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Boston branch, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of housing bill S. 886 and H. R. 2523; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

638. Also, petition of Mrs. Maggie Goldsmith, Orlovista, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

639. Also, petition of John Heather, Lakeland Townsend Club, No. 1, Lakeland, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

640. Also, petition of Mrs. B. F. Crane, Townsend Club No. 1, Zephyrhills, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

641. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou must be grieved, O Lord, that, after nineteen hundred years, mankind never seems to learn how to live by faith, and still prefers worry to trust in God. We know what worry does to us, yet are all too reluctant to discover what faith could do. Since we strain at gnats and swallow camels, give us a new standard of values and the ability to know a trifle when we see it and to deal with it as such. Let us not waste the time Thou hast given us.

So help us God. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 16, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, June 17, 1947, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 69) to prepare a revised edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America as published in 1938 as Senate Document No. 232 of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 26. An act to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape;

S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters;

S. 321. An act to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes;

S. 597. An act to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes; and

S. 614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census).

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1230) to amend sections 2 (a) and 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 599. An act declaring Kenduskeag Stream, Penobscot County, Maine, to be a nonnavigable waterway;

H. R. 1380. An act to amend the laws relating to the payment of 6 months' death gratuity to dependents of naval and Army personnel;

H. R. 1610. An act to amend the act of June 14, 1938, so as to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission to issue its refunding bonds for the purpose of refunding the outstanding bonds issued by the commission to pay the cost of a certain toll bridge at or near Cairo, Ill.;

H. R. 1945. An act to amend sections 2801 (e) (4), 3043 (a), 3044 (b), and 3045 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 1946. An act to amend section 2801 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 1947. An act to amend section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 2167. An act to authorize the inclusion within the Angostura unit of the Missouri Basin project of certain lands owned by the United States;

H. R. 2293. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters," approved February 8, 1895;

H. R. 2314. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, as amended, and to amend section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936, as amended, so as to authorize lump-sum payments under the said acts to the survivors of deceased officers without administration of estates;

H. R. 2721. An act to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946;