By Mr. ANDERSON of California:
H. R. 4348. A bill to facilitate the admission of foreign workers desiring to perform agricultural work in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:
H. R. 4349. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, to increase the penalties specified in such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr BUCK:
H. R. 4350. A bill to amend sections 3, 4, 9, and 14 of the act of June 18, 1934, relating to the establishment of foreign-trade zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. R. 4351. A bill to amend sections 3, 4, 9, and 14 of the act of June 18, 1934, relating to the establishment of foreign-trade zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARHART:
H. R. 4352. A bill to equalize income and excise tax revenues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4353. A bill to repeal the special estate and gift tax provisions relating to community property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4354. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States district courts to adjudicate and report to the Congress their judgments with respect to claims of American nationals for private war losses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK:
H. R. 4355. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to require the nonpartisan election of State administrators of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COMBS:
H. R. 4356. A bill to provide technical and research assistance to the fire-fighting services of the Nation by the establishment of a Federal research agency for the determination of the explosion and fire hazards of chemicals, fertilizers and agricultural materials, explosives, gases, dusts, and similar flammable and explosive materials endangering life and property; and for the development of effective safety measures for the prevention of explosions and fires in chemical, agricultural, and other industries, and shipping areas where flammable and explosive materials are being handled in shipping and transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONOHUE:
H. R. 4357. A bill to raise the minimum-wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4358. A bill to authorize the naturalization of parents of veterans without regard to certain requirements of the naturalization laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4359. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of permitting States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof to secure coverage for their officers and employees under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4360. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4361. A bill to amend the Articles of War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4362. A bill to provide for the payment of retroactive death pension to widows and children of veterans after 7 years' continued and unexplained absence; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4363. A bill to empower the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics for attorneys at law practicing before the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON:
H. R. 4364. A bill to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:
H. R. 4365. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):
H. R. 4366. A bill to vest the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with the control and jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Armory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEST:
H. R. 4367. A bill authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Hidalgo, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART (by request):
H. R. 4368. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAND:
H. R. 4369. A bill to clarify and make certain freedom of expression; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KENNEDY:
H. R. 4370. A bill to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. STEFAN:
H. R. 4371. A bill to amend section 506 of the General Bridge Act of 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TWYMAN:
H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedish pioneers to the Middle West; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:
H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution to authorize the reprinting of certain hearings held on universal military training in the Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:
H. Res. 326. Resolution to end threat to international security in Indonesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:
H. Res. 327. Resolution to create a select committee to review the valuable contributions to the war effort of manufacturers of war materials during World War II and to recommend a suitable form of recognition for such contributions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REES:
H. Res. 330. Resolution providing for funds to carry on investigations, studies, and surveys in the civil service and Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:
H. R. 4372. A bill for the relief of Samuel Fadem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEARHART:
H. R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Elias James Walker Kosmopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:
H. R. 4374. A bill for the relief of Uldric Thompson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4375. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Vincent (Vincenzo) Allegretti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART (by request):
H. R. 4376. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Joseph Armanine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:
H. R. 4377. A bill for the relief of the Consolidated Steel Corp., of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:
H. R. 4378. A bill for the relief of Vojko Svarcenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:
H. R. 4379. A bill for the relief of the Harbor Boat Building Co., the Wilmington Welding & Boiler Works, and B & R Machine Works, of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:
H. R. 4380. A bill for the relief of J. V. and Zena Mendoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY:
H. R. 4381. A bill for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION:
H. R. 4382. A bill for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:
H. R. 4383. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes M. Burke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:
H. R. 4384. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Vice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

764. Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin presented a resolution by local No. 184, UAW-CIO, Racine, Wis., urging passage of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 25, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 16, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., minister emeritus, Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

When thou prayest enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door pray to thy Father which is in secret, and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly.

Teach us, O God, the wisdom of this advice. Amid all the turmoil and confusion of this day's work, help us to preserve this sanctuary of silence within the heart where we can be still and know that Thou art God. Give us the listening ear, that we may catch the whispered accents of Thy counsel whenever we

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

would turn to the right hand or to the left, saying, "This is the way; walk ye in it." Throughout the weary and testing hours of this day may we ever remember that "the eternal God is our refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms."

In the name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 24, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

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, July 25, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1508. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance," approved March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33); and

S. 1515. An act to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, 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. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs.

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 joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2857) to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. REES, Mr. TWYMAN, and Mr. LYLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. TIBBOTT, Mr. SCRIVNER, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, and Mr. NORRELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. WOODRUFF, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MILLS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. WOODRUFF, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MILLS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 104) to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 185. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic Society of Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 197. An act to transfer part of block 14 and the school building thereon of Petersburg town site, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska;

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 348. An act for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block;

H. R. 405. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss;

H. R. 406. An act for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall;

H. R. 434. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Rich;

H. R. 640. An act for the relief of Harley Shores;

H. R. 704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 893. An act for the relief of Myron R. Leard;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lauser;

H. R. 1379. An act to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1497. An act for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor;

H. R. 1652. An act to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of Owen R. Brewster;

H. R. 1995. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service;

H. R. 2005. An act to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations, in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments";

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Elmer A. Norris;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston;

H. R. 2471. An act to provide for periodical reimbursement of the general fund of the District of Columbia for certain expenditures made for the compensation, uniforms, equipment, and other expenses of the United States Park Police force;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp;

H. R. 2511. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim 2 acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church;

H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor;

H. R. 2693. An act for the relief of public utility district No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.;

H. R. 2800. An act to amend section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3055. An act 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;

H. R. 3075. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors;

H. R. 3127. An act to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River;

H. R. 3361. An act for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford;

H. R. 3376. An act to ratify and confirm act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3444. An act to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3448. An act to amend the Federal Home Bank Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3495. An act for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson;

H. R. 3738. An act to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945;

H. R. 3739. An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to acquire certain land as a site for the proposed Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3852. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946;

H. R. 3997. An act to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 4043. An act to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4079. An act to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976);

H. R. 4254. An act providing for the disposition of farm-labor camps to public or semi-public agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers; and

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert V. Fleming as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY STATION WDAY FOR LEGISLATIVE NEWS FURNISHED

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, all during this session radio station WDAY, one of North Dakota's outstanding broadcasting stations, has conducted a most commendable program which has permitted the Members of Congress from its coverage area to report, in a nonpolitical way, the progress of legislation, allowing them freely to express themselves.

The Members of Congress have greatly appreciated this service and wish to commend Station WDAY for making the service possible.

I ask unanimous consent that a telegram I have just received from Station WDAY be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., *July 24, 1947.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

As the first session of the Eightieth Congress of the United States draws close to its final hours, the newsroom of WDAY wishes to express its thanks to the Senators and Representatives from the Northwest for their cooperation during this session in the presentation of Washington news. Through their help we have been able to give this area one of the most complete reports of daily Washington news and of special topics of particular interest to the people of this area. Their response to queries for specific information has at all times enabled us to answer similar queries for information from WDAY's listeners. To Senators MILTON R. YOUNG and WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota; Senators JOSEPH BALL and EDWARD THYE, of Minnesota; Senator HARLAN BUSHFIELD, of South Dakota; and Representatives CHARLES ROBERTSON and WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota; HAROLD HAGEN, of Minnesota; and FRANCIS CASE and KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, the WDAY newsroom extends thanks on this final broadcast of the weekly Washington report.

JACK SWENSON,
News Editor, WDAY.

ATTACKS BY FINANCIAL LOBBYISTS UPON FORMER SENATOR WHEELER

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there has been much comment, verbally and in the press, about lobbies and lobbyists representing various interests concerned with legislation in this session of Congress.

So far, I have not observed mention of one of the most active lobbies, with some of the most skilled lobbyists. I refer to the lobby and lobbyists representing insurance companies and other institutional railroad security holders in their efforts to prevent passage of the so-called Reed bills, presented by Representative CHAUNCEY W. REED in the House, and by myself in the Senate. These bills provide a plan for financial railroad reorganization, including railroads now in the hand of the United States courts.

Harry C. Hagerty, representing the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., could perhaps be given the title of head of the financial lobbyists seeking to defeat this legislation. Mr. Hagerty did not always confine himself to the truth. He appeared before the Senate Interstate Commerce Subcommittee handling this legislation. In a printed statement offered on June 5, of this year, to the Senate subcommittee holding hearings on S. 249, Hagerty used the following language:

> About 6 p. m., one Friday afternoon, in June 1946, when some probable opponents of the legislation (S. 1253, 79th Cong.) were en route to their homes for the week end, Senator Wheeler skillfully guided the bill to passage in the Senate.

This is a malicious falsehood. There is not the slightest foundation for any such statement. I worked closely with Senator Wheeler in writing and handling S. 1253, throughout the entire session. I joined with Senator Wheeler for weeks in trying to secure an opportunity from the then majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to present the bill. It went to the floor of the Senate at the first opportunity afforded. S. 1253 had been on the Senate calendar for some time, with unanimous committee approval, and everybody knew it would be called up at the first opportunity.

Mr. Hagerty and his group of corporation lobbyists have been active and talkative around Washington this year in opposition to the Reed-Myers amendments to S. 249, which proposes a bill similar to S. 1253 of last year. Mr. Hagerty's lobbyists are credited with saying that:

> We were caught asleep last year. We are better organized this year, and S. 249 with the Reed-Myers amendments will never get out of the committee. We have that fixed.

This attack upon Senator Wheeler was made at a time when he was out of the country. However, an opportunity was afforded to Senator Wheeler, upon his return, to file as part of the printed record an answer to Mr. Hagerty's remarks.

The same group was active in circulating rumors that Representative REED would not be able to get his bill out of the House Judiciary Committee. Both bills were reported favorably by the respective committees.

The lobbyists for New York financial interests were correct in their claims that Representative REED would not be able to get the rule necessary for consideration of his bill on the floor of the House. The rule was denied.

They also circulated a report that Senator REED would never be able to get consideration of his bill, after the House acted on their version of the same subject. The Senate bill was being held for favorable action on the part of the House. As such action was not had in the House, there was no occasion to test their boasting.

I have confidence in the Senate committees, including the Republican Policy Committee, and I am quite sure they were wrong.

Financial lobbyists other than Harry Hagerty attacked former Senator Wheeler, long-time chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. One of them was E. W. Bourne, New York lawyer, who described himself as "engaged largely in railroad reorganization work since enactment of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act." Mr. Bourne charged Senator Wheeler with unethical conduct in connection with legislation and railroad proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This attack was made while Senator Wheeler was out of the country. I offer for the RECORD a copy of a letter dated June 18, written by Senator Wheeler to me, as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Subcommittee. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD as part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 17, 1947.*

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
Chairman, Subcommittee
of the Interstate and
Foreign Commerce Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CLYDE: Upon my return today from South America, where I have been for a considerable length of time, the statements of certain witnesses appearing before your subcommittee holding hearings on S. 249, with the amendments proposed by you and Senator MYERS, were brought to my attention. In view of the fact that with you on last year I was a cosponsor of similar legislation and filed several reports with the Senate in connection therewith, I feel impelled to correct at least some of the misstatements and misimpressions made by opposition witnesses, which might otherwise appear unanswered in the record of your hearings.

Mr. Harry C. Hagerty, appearing on behalf of the Security Owners Association and the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., in referring to S. 1253, stated that "when some probable opponents of the legislation were en route to their homes for a week end, Senator Wheeler skillfully guided the bill to passage in the Senate." In this regard you will remember the many efforts that you and I made to get the Senate leadership to set aside time for the debate and vote upon this bill, and that the only time that could be allotted was the very time when the bill was considered. Thus the time was not that of our choice but that impelled upon the leadership by other pending measures. In any event, the legislation was again passed by the Senate without objection; in other words, unanimously, when the vast majority of the Senators were present. I recall this clearly because not only

this legislation but other important legislation was considered on that particular day.

The same witness charges that the two reports submitted by me on this legislation were inaccurate. In view of the length of time that has elapsed since filing these reports, the least that can be said is that this general nonspecific challenge is belatedly made. The first of the two reports was filed with the Senate on February 7, 1947. It was promptly given wide distribution throughout railroad and financial communities and created extensive interest in informed circles. Many articles discussing this report appeared in the press and periodicals. Twenty days after the filing of the report, this witness and a number of his associates testified before the committee. Not one of them challenged a single figure or conclusion contained in the report. When the hearings were continued into March and other witnesses appeared, only one of them raised any question as to the accuracy of that report. This single instance indicates that if there had been even a slight error of fact or judgment contained in the report it would have been found by the magnifying glass to which it was subjected by interested parties. One of the receivers for the Seaboard Air Line Railway said the report gave an erroneous impression of their action in connection with the purchase of the railroad's obligations at a discount. He pointed out that the receivers had bought large quantities of debt, saving millions of dollars for their security holders. This was the method of debt shrinkage proposed by President Truman when in the Senate and favored by many other Senators. The statement in our first report on this question had been based on information supplied by the Commission, but it was promptly amplified in our second report satisfactorily incorporating the information furnished by the Seaboard receivers.

The second report was filed with the Senate on April 11, 1946. It again had the widest circulation. I never received from this witness or any of his associates a criticism of the report. Furthermore, I wish to call your attention to the fact that he does not specify any error of fact or conclusion based thereon. His is merely a general charge of inaccuracy made 14 months after the report was filed. As I stated before and as is indicated by the reports, the statements are fully supported by specific citations to the source of information. Much of the information was quoted verbatim from the sources cited. These sources included the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Reserve Board, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, standard financial manuals, the Association of American Railroads and similar accepted, reputable repositories of corporate data. In addition, they included verbatim testimony given by witnesses, including Mr. Hagerty, who recently challenged the report before your committee.

A second witness, Mr. William Wyer, who appeared before your subcommittee and challenged the accuracy of these reports is an accountant. He also testified as an expert on behalf of the Railroad Security Owners Association. His statement does not appear to challenge the accuracy of any figures supplied by the Commission, the Federal Reserve, the AAR, etc., and incorporated in the two committee reports. He objects to the conclusions drawn from such data and seeks to draw accounting conclusions from them which are different from those contained in the report. In determining the relative weight to be given the conclusions of this witness as an accounting authority, in comparison to the committee reports, I wish to direct your attention to certain facts respecting him. He first appeared some years ago as a witness before the Interstate Commerce Committee at some of whose sessions I presided, and during other sessions when Senator (now President) Truman presided. (See hearings pursuant to S. Res. 71 (74th Cong.) pp. 528–529, 562–565, 578–605, 1105, 1109, 1118, 1129, 4733–4738, 4758, 5031–5063, 5065–5096, 5137–5139, 5141–5216, 5249–5269, 5271–5322.) The witness, then as now, qualified himself as an expert on railroad financial affairs and, in particular, the affairs of a large railroad for which he had acted as treasurer and chief accountant. (Ibid, pp. 579–580.) His transactions in that position were analyzed before the committee by the late Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Joseph B. Eastman, who told the committee categorically that the accountings conducted by that railroad treasurer were false. (Ibid, pp. 541–545.) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation presented the committee with evidence showing that this railroad, on the basis of false financial statements prepared by or under the supervision of this railroad treasurer, obtained large railroad loans. (Ibid, pp. 1112–1113, 1116.) The head of the RFC's Railroad Division informed this treasurer that the transaction effected by him was crooked. (Ibid, p. 1142.) Evidence was also presented to the committee that the RFC had transmitted these facts to the Department of Justice for action. The Department replied that the statute of limitations barred criminal prosecution for that transaction. (Ibid, pp. 1112–1113.) This same railroad treasurer who appeared before your committee the other day as an expert to challenge last year's committee report was given permission by the committee on numerous occasions to explain away the charges against his accounting and financial reports made when treasurer of the railroad in question. (Ibid, e. g. 1129, 5031–5063, 5210–5216, 5249.) On one of those occasions, when Senator (now President) Truman was presiding, this witness finally admitted that his financial entries on reports had been false. (Ibid, 5061–5063.) At a subsequent hearing he retracted this admission and Senator Truman told him, on the record of the hearing, that his testimony of retraction was in the same category as his railroad accounts. (Ibid, p. 5269.)

Subsequently the Interstate Commerce Commission called the attention of Congress to the accounting methods to which this railroad official had resorted.

The third witness, Mr. E. W. Bourne, appearing before your committee recently on behalf of an institutional bondholding group leveled slanderous implications and innuendoes at me and my son. I wish to categorically deny them, lest they be used by this lawyer or his ilk to support future slander by stating that his charges went undenied in the record. But for this probability, I would not accord recognition to his insinuations as to my character and integrity. I am wholly unacquainted with this witness and, therefore, must conclude that his defamation is aimed not at me or my son personally, but is part and parcel of his long campaign as a hireling seeking to expropriate junior security holders in bankruptcy railroads of their property. He and his associate, the accounting witness aforementioned, will obviously lend themselves to any reckless statement or enterprise to protect their obsolete reorganization plans which are designed to impoverish junior security holders and enrich senior creditors. It may be noted in passing that the efforts of this witness are paid for by the debtor but are for the benefit of his clients, a few creditors.

Sincerely.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I resent the constant misrepresentation and distortion of the facts, on the part of these and other lobbyists, and their attacks upon Members of Congress and upon my friend and former colleague, Burton K. Wheeler.

INVESTIGATION OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN CONNECTION WITH ALLEGED ELECTION FRAUDS IN MISSOURI—MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I read on the first page of the calendar of business for today that the pending business is the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 150, to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of Senate Resolution 116, which, Mr. President, is the resolution regarding the inaction of the Department of Justice in connection with the investigation of the Kansas City vote frauds. Of course, the President pro tempore is correct in saying that that business has been temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the appropriation bill to which he has referred.

Mr. President, the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska has been the unfinished business of the Senate for more than a week. Since my name is associated with Resolution 150 and Resolution 116, I have been the recipient of a large number of letters from all over the United States. Many of these letters have enclosed editorial comment.

I brought to the Senate this morning three such editorials, selected as a sample of all the rest. The first is an editorial from the New York Sun of July 23, 1947, headed "Stifling an investigation." This is sent to me by a lady in New York who says that in doing so she is acting for "the entire family."

The second is an editorial from the Washington Post of yesterday, headed "Missouri compromise." In asking that this editorial be inserted in the RECORD, I should like to invite attention to the fact that I have previously, in the last two or three days, inserted editorial comment from the Washington Evening Star and the Washington Times-Herald, and I now add a third Washington paper, the Washington Post.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask to have inserted an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, of Boston, of July 23, 1947, a paper with a national circulation, and long famous throughout the length and breath of the land for its independent, high-minded, fair editorial comment. This editorial is headed "Last Chance to Retrieve."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the three editorials to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Sun of July 23, 1947]

STIFLING AN INVESTIGATION

Though investigation of an inquiry sounds a little complex, it may work out into a simple enough political issue for general understanding in 1948. Republican Senator JAMES P. KEM, of Missouri, has tried, without success, to win authorization for a resolution to investigate the Department of Justice's inquiry into the primary election of 1946 in the Fifth Missouri Congress District. Democratic obstruction has blocked passage of this resolution.

What Senator KEM asks is not an inquiry into the primary election itself, which a Missouri grand jury has already found to be

tainted with fraud. It was at this primary election that Roger C. Slaughter, Democratic candidate for renomination as Representative, was purged at the express wish of President Truman and with the all too effective help of the Pendergast machine in Kansas City. Those Kansas City wards which in previous years had given suspiciously large majorities to every favorate of the machine last year provided the votes to defeat Slaughter, but Enos Axtell, winner in the Democratic primary, was himself eliminated at the polls in November. What Senator KEM seeks to find out is why the Federal Bureau of Investigation, subordinate to the Attorney General, made so limited an investigation, why it confined its inquiries to half a dozen or so possible witnesses. It is significant that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, certainly never a Republican organ, believes that KEM is right and that such Democrats as HATCH and MCCARRAN, who have opposed the investigation, are wrong.

If the Democrats are successful in stifling this inquiry they will be inviting the public to use its imagination at will. An investigation, on the other hand, might provide a generally satisfactory explanation of why the Department of Justice conducted the kind of inquiry it did.

[From the Washington Post of July 25, 1947]

MISSOURI COMPROMISE

Senate Democrats are inevitably adding to the suspicion that in blocking the inquiry into the Missouri vote scandal they have something to hide. This seems to us abysmally poor politics. The mere attempt to suppress a probe by the Senate Judiciary Committee has made the matter a sure issue in the 1948 campaign, regardless of the facts in the case. Moreover, if, as the administration contends, the Justice Department did nothing to whitewash the original investigation, then the Senate bloc has done a disservice to Attorney General Clark. If his skirts are clean, Mr. Clark should welcome an opportunity to tell his story fully.

The issue now has gone far beyond the attempt by President Truman to purge Congressman Roger Slaughter at last summer's primary. The mechanics of the steal engineered by the Pendergast machine in Kansas City are now being brought out by a Federal grand jury and the FBI. These facts will come to light irrespective of congressional action. It will be impossible to camouflage them. But there are other relevant questions which ought to be answered by the administration. The country has a right to know why the preliminary FBI investigation was so restricted in scope and why the matter was dropped by the Department of Justice until outside pressure forced the administration to take it up again. Possibly there is a logical explanation for this seeming effort to call off the dogs. But certainly the obstructionism of the Senate Democrats only weakens the administration's pose of innocence.

Doubtless, as has been charged, there is some political motivation behind the Kem resolution which the Democrats are blocking. But no smear the Republicans could concoct would be worse than what the Democrats are doing to themselves. For when the facts do come out, they will do so with far more damaging effect than if the Democrats had aided the inquiry. Quite apart from any partisan considerations, the disclosures to date thoroughly warrant a congressional investigation both of the primary and of the inexcusable dalliance in following up the irregularities. By hamstringing the effort to get at the truth, the Democrats have only contributed to the smell of a situation that is already highly obnoxious.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, of July 23, 1947]

LAST CHANCE TO RETRIEVE

One of the saddest things about Congress is that it cannot even reach after an election fraud without getting into partisan politics up to its eyes. The current battle over whether the Senate should or should not investigate charges that somebody held back the FBI in the Kansas City vote-fraud case seems no exception.

Making due allowance, nevertheless for all the axes waiting to be ground, and any taints in motives, we believe the Kansas City story is bad enough, on the very face of it, so that every questionable stone should be turned.

The Republicans have campaign ammunition to gain and nothing worse than a fizzle to lose by such an investigation. The Democrats risk much either way. But we doubt that anything Senate probers might dig up would be as damaging in the 1948 campaign as public suspicion that worse things had been covered up.

We do not believe Mr. Truman himself had anything to do with the irregularities. But he did unwisely put a finger in a local primary election. He did accept the aid of the unregenerate remnant of the old Pendergast machine in that election. And ever since evidence of fraud was first unearthed by the Kansas City Star, and later by a Jackson County grand jury, his handling of the matter has worked a clumsy disservice to himself, his party, and to faith in democratic processes generally.

The hour is late. There is much that Mr. Truman has lost by these fumblings that he cannot retrieve. But he can call off the Democratic Senators who are threatening a filibuster, and let the Senate have a closer look at the Justice Department's behavior if it wants to.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which is engaged in the consideration of the nomination of Roy W. Harper, to be United States district judge for eastern and western districts of Missouri, may hold a hearing during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, BUREAU OF MINES OF INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 102)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior, amounting to $500,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 101)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, amounting to $300,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF A NAVAL LANDING CRAFT TO EX-NAVY-ARMY-PERSONNEL CLUB, LAKE JACKSON, TEX.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Ex-Navy-Army Personnel Boating Club, of Lake Jackson, Tex., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a naval landing craft to be used in the training and recreation of its members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

COACHELLA VALLEY DIVISION OF ALL-AMERICAN CANAL PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report by the Bureau of Reclamation of that Department, on the engineering feasibility, the total estimated cost, and the allocation and probable repayment of these costs of the distribution system and flood-control works on the Coachella Valley division, All-American Canal project, California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

INTERIM REPORT ON POTENTIAL WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENTS IN COLORADO RIVER BASIN

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report dated July 19, 1947, on the status of the investigations of that Department on the potential water resource developments in the Colorado River Basin (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the 30-day period ended June 28, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS' BILL OF 1947

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUDIT REPORT OF INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARY CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Inland Waterways Corporation and subsidiary corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 3332. A bill creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 758).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two-hundredth anniversary

of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.; without amendment; and

S. Res. 156. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; without amendment.

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1551. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of unimproved land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I.; without amendment (Rept. No. 756).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1260. A bill to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 757).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1302. A bill to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 764).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1632. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain troop kitchen railway cars to the War Department, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 765).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 4308. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics; without amendment (Rept. No. 766).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 468. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Imperial Palace, Dramatic Order Knights of Khorassan," to increase the amount of property which the corporation may hold from $100,000 to $5,000,000; without amendment (Rept. No. 760);

S. 1431. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edna Mary Jakimowicz; without amendment (Rept. No. 759);

H. R. 890. A bill for the relief of Jessie Thompkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 762);

H. R. 3690. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 763); and

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; with amendments (Rept. No. 761).

By Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 4347. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 767).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1725. A bill for the relief of Fred S. Tutton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1726. A bill to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 1727. A bill to authorize and direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate freight rates which are applicable with respect to shipments within, to, and from the Mountain-Pacific rate territory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1728. A bill for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1729. A bill for the relief of Gudrun Emma Ericsson; and

S. 1730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1731. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide annuities for custodial personnel of the Bureau of Prisons who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1732. A bill for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1733. A bill to authorize payment to certain enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians under act of July 2, 1942 (Public, No. 645, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. WAGNER) introduced Senate bill 1734, to amend the Social Security Act by providing for a national system of unemployment and temporary disability insurance, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1735. A bill to establish two migratory waterfowl zones in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1736. A bill to provide for continued research for the purpose of developing improved prosthetic appliances for veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MOORE:

S. 1737. A bill to amend the Judicial Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1738. A bill for the relief of Ferd H. Gibler; and

S. 1739. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Beatrice Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one-hundredth anniversary of the poultry business in the United States; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution rescinding an order of the Federal Power Commission authorizing redevelopment of the Wilder Dam project; to the Committee on Public Works.

NATIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT AND TEMPORARY DISABILITY INSURANCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Social Security Act by providing for a national system of unemployment and temporary disability insurance, and I request that an explanatory statement of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1734) to amend the Social Security Act by providing for a national system of unemployment and temporary disability insurance, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. WAGNER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY EXPLAINING PURPOSE OF BILL TO BROADEN AND LIBERALIZE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

The bill provides for:

1. Broadening unemployment insurance protection to cover about 10,000,000 jobs now excluded, such as agricultural labor, domestic service, employees of nonprofit institutions and employees of small firms.

2. Payments of benefits to an insured person out of work due to sickness or disability. Only two States—Rhode Island and California—now provide such protection to insured persons.

3. Payment of insurance benefits ranging from a minimum weekly benefit of $5 to a maximum weekly benefit of $30, depending in each individual case upon the previous wages of the insured individual and the number of his dependents. Illustrative benefits for a man earning about $40 a week in wages are as follows: Single man, $20; man and wife, $26; man, wife, and children, $30.

4. Payment of benefits for a maximum duration of 26 weeks, after a 1-week waiting period. In the case of the unemployment insurance, the maximum duration of benefits may be increased to 52 weeks if funds are adequate.

5. Substituting a single simplified national system of unemployment and disability insurance for the present complicated State-by-State system.

6. Establishment of a National Advisory Council and State and local advisory bodies to advise on all aspects of the program and to assure decentralization of administration.

INVESTIGATION OF REORGANIZATION OF RAILROADS

Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. MYERS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 157), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas many railroads in the continental United States are in the hands of trustees because of insolvency proceedings brought under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act; and

Whereas the mileage of these railroads is approximately 25,000, and the investment in road and equipment amounts to several billion dollars; and

Whereas many of these roads entered bankruptcy in 1933, 1934, 1935, or 1936, 10 to 14 years ago, and the earnings of these roads in recent years have been sufficient to accumulate large cash amounts, and have placed such roads in a solvent position; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission, which approved reorganization plans for most of these railroads nearly 7 years ago, has ignored vastly changed financial conditions in which these railroads are now situate, and is permitting wholly unwarranted and

unnecessary forfeiture of hundreds of millions of dollars in securities to take place; and

Whereas court proceedings involving some very important railroads are in such a condition that it is difficult if not impossible to approximate the time when reorganization under section 77 will be completed, and it is feasible for a number of these roads to retire part of their indebtedness, at a discount, and to refund or extend the maturity date of the balance of their indebtedness, and it further appears desirable to discharge such railroads from bankruptcy proceedings without the necessity of drastic reorganizations under section 77; and

Whereas Congress is witnessing the anomaly of the Supreme Court of the United States refusing to review a lower-court decision approving an original reorganization plan for one railroad which would have wiped out $45,000,000 par value of stock and creditors' claims while at the same time the creditors of that railroad have agreed upon and the Interstate Commerce Commission has approved a new reorganization plan which avoids any forfeiture of security values; and

Whereas the continued holding of roads that have become solvent in trustee or receiver operation as insolvent roads, and further effort to reorganize, under section 77, railroads which no longer need such reorganization, are contrary to the general public interest, contrary to sound public policy, and are bringing into disrepute the administration of justice by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts; and

Whereas the President of the United States has joined with Congress in going on record in favor of modifications of present reorganization legislation and in favor of the principles proposed by the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives in 1946, and in favor of the principles enacted by Congress in 1946, and the President has further urged the strengthening of such proposals and the adoption of further provisions to carry out those general principles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a complete and thorough investigation of administration by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts, and actions of trustees, and all other parties in interest, and counsel therefore, with reference to plans of reorganization and proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. The committee is directed to report to the Senate as early as practicable, with such recommendations as to changes in existing law as may be found desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

INVESTIGATION OF CHARGES AGAINST OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL CONTROLS IN COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 158), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce controls, by a system of licenses, exports of agricultural and other products; and

Whereas such Office of International Trade is alleged to claim that it has issued such licenses for export of agricultural and other products on the basis of so-called historical records; and

Whereas it is alleged that, while said Office of International Trade claims to be issuing export licenses on the basis of historical records that, in fact, such Office is issuing licenses arbitrarily and through favoritism and other considerations and without regard to historical records; and

Whereas it is alleged that export licenses issued as above stated and services promising to procure such licenses are now being peddled on a so-called black market; and

Whereas information is current that export licenses covering agricultural and other products may be secured without undue delay by and through the employment of certain agents; and

Whereas such allegations and charges are bringing said Office of International Trade and the Department of Commerce into bad repute: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the allegations and charges made against the said Office of International Trade, and that the committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable data the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, and as follows:

First, that a list of all applications for export licenses, giving the name or names and the address of each applicant for export licenses, and the number or amount of the commodity covered in such application made prior to July 1, 1947.

Second, a list of all export licenses issued prior to July 1, 1947, covering agricultural and other products and the number or amount of the commodity embraced in each said export license.

Third, all information developed with regard to the program being followed by said Office of International Trade in the issuing of such export licenses; and

Fourth, recommendations of needed legislation with respect to the subject matter mentioned in this resolution.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee shall not exceed $10,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF PRESIDENT'S TEMPORARY COMMISSION ON EMPLOYEE LOYALTY

Mr. McGRATH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 159), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the report of the President's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty be printed as a Senate document.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 25, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 358. An act for the relief of Julian M. Thomas;

S. 483. An act to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

S. 526. An act to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes;

S. 706. An act for the relief of William D. McCormick; and

S. 1368. An act to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to increase the size of isolated disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold, and for other purposes.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to acknowledge from the Secretary of State a request for the appointment of Senators to serve as members of the Advisory Committee for the Foreign Service Institute. The Foreign Service Institute was established under authority granted by the Congress by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, providing training and instruction to officers and employees of the Foreign Service and of the Department of State and to other officers and employees of the Government for whom training and instruction in the field of foreign relations is necessary.

In response to the request of the Secretary of State the Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

JOSEPH J. PICKETT—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 99)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith without my approval S. 484, "To authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Joseph J. Pickett a patent in fee to certain land."

The effect of this measure would be to terminate the trust under which the United States now holds the lands allotted to and inherited by Mr. Pickett on the Crow Indian Reservation, and to require a conveyance of the lands to him free from the restrictions on alienation now imposed by law. Whether the consent of Mr. Pickett would be a prerequisite to such termination and conveyance is a matter on which the terms of the bill are silent.

The situation here presented is one which involves the performance of trust agreements that the United States is bound faithfully to execute, as distinguished from the continuance of a personal disability. Mr. Pickett, in common with other Indians, is entirely free to purchase lands or other property, and to sell the same as he pleases. What is here in question is land that forms a part of the ancestral tribal holdings of the Crow

Indians, and a part of an area which, pursuant to various arrangements with these Indians, has been divided among the individual members of the Crow Tribe. Mr. Pickett obtained a share in this division of the tribal patrimony solely because of his membership, or that of his ancestors, in the Crow Tribe. Under the terms of the allotment arrangements, and the implementing statutes, he has no right to alienate the lands allotted to or inherited by him without the consent of the United States, acting in its capacity as trustee of the lands. With respect to most of the area described in the bill, such approval may now be granted by the Secretary of the Interior should it be found that Mr. Pickett is competent to manage his affairs.

In the performance of the existing trust obligations consideration must be given to the question of whether a sale of the lands would promote the best interests of all concerned. These include Mr. Pickett, as the beneficiary of the trust, and the Crow Tribe, as a party to its creation and maintenance. Indicative of the interests of the latter is the fact that the Crow Tribe expressly stipulated, in the basic allotment agreement, that a restriction upon alienation, whether by voluntary conveyance or by operation of law, should be incorporated in every patent.

The record in the present case clearly indicates that termination of the trust would be contrary to the best interests of Mr. Pickett. The lands that would be released exceed the average Indian holding in quality and extent, and yield a good rental income. Conditions of age and health prevent Mr. Pickett from engaging in active farming operations, and, combined with lack of experience, restrict his opportunities for other types of business undertakings. The proceeds of properties sold in the past have not been successfully reinvested by him, and apart from the trust lands his only source of income is a retirement pension from the United States. Partially dependent upon him for support are a wife and three small children. All things considered, the future security of Mr. Pickett and his family would appear to lie in the retention of the trust lands, which constitute his principal capital asset, rather than in risking the loss of this sound investment through more speculative ventures.

The record also clearly indicates that termination of the trust would violate the best interests of the Crow Tribe. The economic well-being of this group of citizens is vitally dependent upon the continued ownership and use by them of the remaining Indian grazing lands on the Crow Reservation. Mr. Pickett's holdings are scattered through four different grazing units in one of the best grazing areas on the reservation, and control a key water supply. They are for the most part surrounded by other lands in Indian ownership. The sale of these holdings to a non-Indian would isolate adjoining Indian lands, would cut them off from necessary water, and would render the position of some of the surrounding Indian landowners precarious indeed.

In these circumstances it seems to me that the responsibilities of the United States for the faithful discharge of its trust obligations preclude the termination at this time of the existing trust of the lands allotted to and inherited by Mr. Pickett.

I also wish to point out that the Congress has established, by general law, procedures under which cases such as the present may be adjusted in ways both equitable and practical. Under existing statutes applicable to the Crow Reservation, the Secretary of the Interior would have authority, upon application by Mr. Pickett, to sell for his benefit one-half of his 640-acre homestead, and any of the other lands allotted to or inherited by him, should a sale of part of his capital assets become essential for his support. Such a procedure would not entail the disregard of Indian interests, and of Federal responsibilities for their protection, that is inherent in the present bill, however well-intentioned.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval from S. 484.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 25, 1947.*

GIDEON PEON—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 100)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith without my approval S. 403, authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gideon Peon.

The effect of this measure would be to enable Mr. Peon to terminate at will the trust under which the United States now holds the lands allotted to him on the Flathead Indian Reservation, and to permit him to demand a conveyance of the lands free from the restrictions on alienation now imposed by law.

The situation here presented is one which involves the performance of trust agreements that the United States is bound faithfully to execute, as distinguished from the continuance of a personal disability. Mr. Peon, in common with other Indians, is entirely free to purchase lands or other property, and to sell the same as he pleases. What is here in question is land that forms a part of the ancestral tribal holdings of the Flathead Indians, and a part of an area which, pursuant to various arrangements with these Indians, has been divided among the individual members of the Flathead Tribe. Mr. Peon obtained a share in this division of the tribal patrimony solely because of his membership in the Flathead Tribe. Under the terms of the allotment arrangements, and the implementing statutes, he has no right to alienate the lands allotted to him without the consent of the United States, acting in its capacity as trustee of the lands. Such approval may now be granted by the Secretary of the Interior should it be found that Mr. Peon is competent to manage his affairs.

In the performance of the existing trust obligations consideration must be given to the question of whether a sale of the lands would promote the best interests of all concerned. These include Mr. Peon, as the beneficiary of the trust, and the Flathead Tribe, as a party to its creation and maintenance. Indicative of the interests of the latter is the fact that the treaty confirming the Indian title to the Flathead Reservation expressly declared that the reservation should be for the exclusive use and benefit of the Flathead Tribe, and that non-Indians should not be permitted to reside thereon without the permission of the tribe.

In the present case the record does not clearly indicate that termination of the trust would be to the best interests of Mr. Peon. The lands that would be released currently yield him a rental of more than 6 percent on their estimated value, and the possibilities for reinvesting the proceeds of a sale are linked by current market conditions.

On the other hand, the record does clearly indicate that termination of the trust would violate the best interests of the Flathead Tribe. The economic well-being of this group of citizens is vitally dependent upon the continued ownership and use by them of the remaining Indian grazing lands on the Flathead Reservation. Mr. Peon's allotment is so located that its sale to a non-Indian would tend to diminish the utility of adjoining Indian lands, and to hamper the development of workable Indian grazing units in the area. Consolidation of scattered tracts into such units is essential if the Flathead Indians are to enjoy a decent living.

In these circumstances it seems to me that the responsibilities of the United States for the faithful discharge of its trust obligations preclude the granting to Mr. Peon of the right to terminate at will the existing trust of the lands allotted to him.

I also wish to point out that the Congress has established, by general law, procedures under which cases such as the present may be adjusted in ways both equitable and practical. These procedures afford room for accommodating to each other the legitimate aspiration of Mr. Peon to have the fullest possible measure of freedom in managing his business affairs, and the equally legitimate aspiration of the Flathead Tribe to preserve its ancestral homelands as a source of livelihood for its members. Under existing statutes applicable to the Flathead Reservation, the Secretary of the Interior would have authority, upon application by Mr. Peon, to offer his allotment for sale, at not less than its appraised value, to the Flathead Tribe or to any of the members thereof, whichever may be the higher bidder. If such efforts did not result in a sale at a fair price being consummated within a reasonable time, I believe the Secretary of the Interior would be justified in concluding that adequate recognition had been given the interests of the tribe and its members. An application by Mr. Peon for termination of the trust and the issuance of a patent in fee could then be considered favorably, if supported by

an adequate showing of Mr. Peon's qualifications. Such a procedure would not entail the disregard of Indian interests, and of Federal responsibilities for their protection, that is inherent in the present bill, however well-intentioned.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval from S. 403.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 25, 1947.*

THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY DEVELOPMENT

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio discussion on the subject of the St. Lawrence waterway development, participated in by himself, Senator WILEY, Dr. N. R. Danielian, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO SENATOR IVES BY THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial commending Senator IVES, from the Washington Post of July 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE HENRY FORD—ADDRESS BY HON. SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, on Sunday, April 20, 1947, reviewing the life of the late Henry Ford, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUMMARY OF AGRICULTURAL COORDINATION ACT OF 1947

[Mr STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the Agricultural Coordination Act of 1947, prepared by the Farm Bureau Federation, which appears in the Appendix.]

BOARD OF FOREIGN SCHOLARSHIPS APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. FULERIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a White House release regarding the Board of Foreign Scholarships appointed by the President, a statement by himself regarding the same subject, and an editorial entitled "Value in a Foreign Study Plan," from the Kansas City Star of July 20, 1947, which appear in the Appendix.]

LOBBYING AT THE CAPITOL—ARTICLE BY JOSEPH AND STEWART ALSOP

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Little Foxes," published in the July 25, 1947, issue of the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is the continuing consideration of House bill 4269, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

INFORMATION SERVICE, STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday I said I would make a motion to take up for consideration Order No. 602, House bill 3342, which is the bill involving what is called the Voice of America. I realize that motion is not in order at this time. I hope—and I am very earnest in the expression of the hope—that the leadership of this body will permit a vote on this bill before we finally adjourn and return to our homes.

The only thing I can do now, in the present parliamentary situation, is to ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of House bill 3342, and I make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico submits a unanimous-consent request. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it will be impossible to grant the request at this time, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement made relative to the appropriation bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator gives me a ray of hope. He says "at this time."

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. May I hope that possibly we may have a vote during this session?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want the ray to grow too bright, but I will say that at an opportune time the Senator will have just as much right as any other Senator again to ask unanimous consent, or even to make a motion; but under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into earlier this morning it will be impossible to grant the Senator's request at this time, and I deeply regret to have to object to the request of my distinguished friend from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from New Mexico has said——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico if I may indulge the hope that the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 150 may be reached for a vote at the present session of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Is the Senator asking me that question?

Mr. KEM. Yes; as one of the determined clique who have barred a vote on the measure for more than a week.

Mr. HATCH. It is perfectly agreeable to me to have the Senate vote on the Senator's resolution, and if the Senator from Missouri will ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed immediately to vote on it, the Senator from New Mexico will not object, and I hope that Senators on the other side of the aisle will be as generous with my request as I am with that of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, hope springs eternal in the human breast. I now ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 150.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All the Senator has to do is to ask for the regular order, because that is the business of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the regular order be now taken up.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the absence of members of the Judiciary Committee who are involved, and in the absence of unanimous consent——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. No unanimous-consent request is necessary, is it? The Senator from Missouri has demanded the regular order, has he not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri asked unanimous consent. It is that on which the Senator from Kentucky is commenting.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement entered into this morning that, following the enactment of certain legislation, the Senator from Nevada would have the right to the floor, of course I think it is unfair to the Senator from Nevada to propose such a request at this time, and on that account I am compelled to object.

Mr. KEM. I have been under the impression that the minority leader was in charge of the filibuster against the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a gratuitous and incorrect statement. I have not been in charge of any filibuster. There has been no filibuster. There has been more time consumed on the majority side since the resolution was taken up—four times as much as has been consumed by anyone on the minority side.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, that is a gratuitous and incorrect statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if we are going to contest in gratuities and incorrections, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I may remind the Senator from Kentucky that he was the one who first used the expression.

Mr. BARKLEY. We entered into an agreement here. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All the various hopes expressed by Senators will be recorded in the Journal and the RECORD. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is in charge of the appropriation bill.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion so that I may make an inquiry?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. So the RECORD may be clear, the Senator from Nebraska referred to a unanimous-consent agreement made earlier today. What was that agreement, may I ask?

Mr. WHERRY. It was that the pending business before the Senate—the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska to take up Senate Resolution 150—be temporarily displaced, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4269, that none of the rights the Senator from Nevada had at the time

he was discussing the motion to take up Senate Resolution 150 should be lost to him, and that the maximum time in which the Senate was to discuss H. R. 4269 would be limited by 7 o'clock a. m.; after which the motion to recess until 12 o'clock noon today was agreed to.

There was also a statement made by the senior Senator from Ohio to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that within the limitation of 1 hour each the two so-called veterans' bills, having to do with the ceiling on trainees in industry and on the farm, would be given the next priority in the consideration of the agenda upon which the Senate is now working.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the Senator telling me that the statement of the Senator from Ohio to the Senator from Georgia and to the Senator from Oregon is any part of the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. WHERRY. Except this, that the Senator from Ohio stated that he would move to take them up in the event that unanimous consent——

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is what I wanted to ascertain.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Ohio was that he would try to get consideration for the two bills. He was to make the attempt.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; he would try.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want that distinctly understood, because I heard the Senator from Ohio say he would undertake to have the bills taken up for consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand that it is no part of a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. I stand corrected. I do not want to be technical.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There is no technicality.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, anyone could be technical about any bill. It is my understanding that at the conclusion of the consideration of the appropriation bill, the Senator from Ohio said he would try to see that the two veterans' bills would be considered. I am asking the distinguished Senator if we may proceed. I think if we put the time on the appropriation bill, we shall conclude it, and that will be the assurance of the Senator from West Virginia that we shall get to the other bill just as quickly as possible.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that I put the question to the Senator, because I want it perfectly clear in the RECORD what the unanimous-consent agreement is. I thought the unanimous-consent agreement was—and I want the able Senator to pay attention to what I am saying at the moment——

Mr. WHERRY. I am trying to find it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That the motion of the Senator from Nebraska in relation to Senate Resolution 150 would be laid aside, that House bill 2469 be taken up and disposed of, and that the Senator from Nevada would not lose his rights on the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And that that was the end of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Prior to that time, the Senator from Georgia raised a question in connection with a bill in which he is interested—I think it is Calendar 610, House bill 2181 relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans—as to whether or not it was a part of a unanimous-consent agreement. It was then that the Senator from Ohio rose and stated that he would try to have the bill considered at the conclusion of the consideration of the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair give to the Senator from West Virginia some information?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be delighted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no unanimous-consent agreement on the Senate record except to proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill. Any subsequent arrangements will be at the discretion of the Senate. The Senator from West Virginia will have his opportunity.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I have just suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the first amendment passed over was——

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I was going to suggest, myself. I did not know the Senator was suggesting it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Baldwin	Hawkes	Murray
Ball	Hayden	Myers
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brewster	Hill	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair suggests to the Senator from Minnesota that there are three committee amendments which have not been passed upon as yet, and in the ordinary course we would revert to those amendments.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I suggest that we revert to the first committee amendment passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first committee amendment passed over, which is on page 17, line 16.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 16, after the word "law", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the National Labor Relations Board shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any person appointed as an additional member or as general counsel of such Board (as provided in section 3 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended), whose nomination has not been confirmed by the Senate."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the first committee amendment which was passed over.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I can explain the amendment very briefly. As the Senate well knows, the three positions mentioned in the limitation—the two additional members of the National Labor Relations Board and the general counsel of the Board, who is a very important official under the new Taft-Hartley Act—were all provided for in that act. They will administer and put into effect many major changes in the National Labor Relations Act, which were included in the new labor-management law. That act, Mr. President, was vetoed by the President, who in his message denounced it in the strongest possible terms, but it was enacted into law over his veto by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress.

Nominations for the three positions were not sent to the Senate until Monday of this week, I believe it was, very late. We were able to hold hearings for about 5 hours on Wednesday afternoon, on those nominations, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as I understand, has reported all three nominations to the Senate.

In the Appropriations Committee, I offered the limitation provided in the amendment, feeling that simply because of the sharp and complete difference of viewpoint between the Congress and the President respecting the legislation

which these three officials will administer and carry into effect, it was more important than ever that before these officials entered upon their duties their nominations should be passed upon by the Senate as required by the law. In other words, simply because of the difference between the Chief Executive and the Congress on this legislation, which difference was fundamental, it seemed to the committee that it would be wise to provide that none of these officials should serve unless they had actually been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, should the Senate not act, or refuse to confirm any of these nominations, it will not seriously impair, in my opinion, carrying out the act. The amendments to the Wagner Act in any event do not become effective until August 23. The Board can function with three members, and should one of those members become incapacitated, the limitation would not apply to an appointment by the President to fill the vacancy. If the general consul should not be confirmed—I have no doubt he will b because I think his nomination was reported unanimously by the committee—but even if he were not confirmed the Board could appoint an acting counsel who could carry on the functions of the general counsel. It will be only 5 months until the Senate meets again and can act on any nominations which the President may make.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. While it has happened before that upon the adjournment of Congress some sort of limitation has been included in an appropriation bill providing that no compensation shall be paid to any appointee who has not been confirmed by the Senate, it has been a rare occasion indeed when the Senate has included such a limitation in a bill.

This limitation does not prevent the President from appointing members of the Board and the general counsel in the event the Senate does not confirm the nominations of those who have been appointed. It merely provides that they cannot receive any pay. They would have to serve without pay for 5 months. I do not know what the President would do in regard to these appointments if the Senate should fail to confirm these three nominations. I have an idea that if the Senate were to reject any one of them outright the President would not give such a person a recess appointment. If the Senate fails to act upon it, the President may be justified in giving a recess appointment to his nominee whose nomination has been allowed to lapse.

Surely the Senate does not wish to put itself in the position of requiring that even for so short a period as 5 months anyone appointed by the President, if he should be required to fill a vacancy on the Board, would have to serve without pay. We do not want to create a situation in which no one but a rich man can be appointed on the Board, or as general counsel of the Board.

The fact that the committee has reported these nominations encourages me to hope that this amendment would be ineffective, because if the nominations were confirmed the amendment itself would be without effect.

Let us consider the history of this legislation. It was urged by the proponents of the legislation that it was all important to increase the membership of the National Labor Relations Board, and also that the general counsel should be independent of the Board itself. He is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. In effect, he is the czar of the National Labor Relations Board, because he is not beholden to them for anything. The sponsors of this legislation evidently felt that it was important to have such a man as general counsel and that it was important to increase the membership from three to five. Haste was urged in the legislation because of exigencies which might arise or emergencies growing out of a labor controversy.

So if we are to assume that the sponsors of this legislation acted in good faith—which I do—in urging the increase in membership and setting up the general counsel, it seems very inconsistent to me, in an appropriation bill on the very eve of the adjournment of Congress, to provide that in the event we do not confirm any of these nominations the President may appoint only someone who has enough money to work for the Government for 5 months without being paid. That is an incongruous situation. It is an unfair situation. It is an utterly inconsistent provision for the Senate of the United States to take. Therefore I am opposed to the amendment, and I hope it will not be adopted. If it is adopted, I hope that the confirmation of these nominations will nullify the effect of the amendment. But there is no way to know, at this stage of the session, what will happen.

I think the President has been very fair in these nominations from a political standpoint. The general counsel is said to be a Republican of very considerable experience in dealing with labor matters. One of the appointees on the Board, Mr. Gray, of Buffalo, is also said to be a Republican of standing and experience. The other appointee served with us for 6 years as a Member of the United States Senate. We know him. Some of the Members of the Senate who served with him undoubtedly disagree with him about some things, but he is a fair-minded man. He is an experienced man. He is an able man and an outstanding lawyer. In my judgment, he will be a very creditable, acceptable, and useful member of the Board.

I hope that all these nominations will be confirmed so that there will be no hiatus between the operation of the law and any future event or exigency which may arise.

It seems to me a little unusual, in view of the insistence of the sponsors of the legislation upon an increase in the membership of the Board and the setting up of a wholly independent general counsel, that we are now confronted with the proposal that unless we confirm these appointments neither they—if they should be given recess appointments—nor anyone else could draw any compensation from now until next January, or such other time as the Senate might confirm any nominations to any of these positions.

Therefore I oppose the amendment. I hope it will not be included in the bill, because I think it would be a disservice to the country and to the Board, and would put the Senate in a very false light to include this rider or limitation in the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 17, line 16.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think it would be very unfortunate if the amendment proposed by the committee were adopted. The framers of the so-called Taft-Hartley Act clearly believed that the 5-member National Labor Relations Board was the right sized Board to function most efficiently. It is very important that the Board function efficiently during the first few months of its existence as a new Board. Therefore, if two members were not permitted for any reason to serve on the Board, or were financially unable to serve for nothing, it is perfectly obvious that it could not work at its best, which would be very unfortunate.

Furthermore, it would appear that the amendment is aimed at two men. I do not like legislating for one or two men. It sems likely that the nomination for general counsel will be approved before we adjourn tomorrow night. No substantial opposition to him has arisen from any quarter. But it also seems likely that there might be protracted debate upon two nominations for the National Labor Relations Board, which would necessitate putting the vote on their approval over until next January.

I believe we should have a full Board between now and January. I also believe the two men nominated for the Board would be confirmed if there were time to debate the matter and reach a vote on their confirmation at this session. It appears perfectly possible, however, that their confirmation may be delayed for 5 months. In the meantime, why should we not have a full Board at work so that the greatest value possible can be derived from the new Labor Relations Act? It seems to me very unwise to adopt any amendment to the bill which might prevent the act from being administered as efficiently as possible.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to say that I do not think the committee feels too deeply about this amendment. I think that when it was put into the bill we were of the opinion that the interim appointments would be barred completely. Further study has convinced us that an interim appointee could actually serve. The only thing that would be stopped would be his drawing pay from the appropriation. I think there are probably a number of persons who would not hesitate to serve without pay.

I shall support the amendment on the fundamental consideration that because of the extremely sharp division on this measure between the President and the Congress the Senate should pass on these nominees before they actually serve.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 17, line 16.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment which was passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 26, after line 19, to insert the following:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system: For an additional amount "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system," $1,184,700, and in addition to the contract authorization included in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, the Administrator is authorized to contract in the fiscal year 1948 for materials and equipment for power-transmission facilities in an amount not in excess of $790,600.

In addition to the contract authorization contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, and the additional contract authorization contained herein, the Administrator is authorized to contract in the fiscal year 1948 for materials and equipment for the Idaho Panhandle power transmission facilities in an amount not in excess of $489,000.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this is an appropriation and a contract authorization for the construction of two transmission lines connected with the Bonneville Power Administration. They are feeder-lines off the main grid connecting two great dams. The Senate approved the projects in the Interior Department bill, but after a very long and arduous conference the House was adamant in refusing to include them in the bill and insisted that the whole agreement we had worked out would go overboard if the Senate insisted on these items which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] considered essential to the whole project. The Appropriations Committee agreed to provide in the bill for those two lines and the following one, which is in the same situation, but is located in the Panhandle of Idaho, in order to give the Senator from Oregon one more opportunity to see if he could persuade the House to go along.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my senior colleague [Mr. CORDON] is attending a committee meeting at the present moment. Hence, in his behalf I want to make a very brief statement urging Senate approval of the Bonneville item in the supplemental appropriation bill. Unless this appropriation providing for transmission facilities for the lines known as the Detroit-Eugene, Eugene-Reedsport, and Reedsport-Coos Bay transportation facilities, is granted, the people in this section of the State of Oregon will continue to be denied the electric power which they so sorely need for their industrial development, as well as for their home and farm needs.

I think it is very unfortunate that this amount was not left in the Bonneville appropriation, but that is now water over the dam, so to speak. The issue before us is whether or not Congress is going to be fair and just to the people in the so-called Portland to Eugene to Reedsport transmission-grid area, or is going to permit factors within the Congress over which they have no control, and personal antagonisms against some Bonneville officials entertained by some Members of Congress, to cause the potential electric-power consumers of this section of Oregon to be denied what I consider to be their just right insofar as having made available to them Bonneville power is concerned.

As my senior colleague would tell the Senate if he were on the floor, he and I have had a great many representations during the year from the people in this section of the State of Oregon, particularly in the Florence, Oreg., area. The record is perfectly clear that these people have suffered unnecessary losses and inconveniences because of their inability to secure sufficient power from Bonneville, and that goes, of course, also for all the farmers and consumers who would be served by these transmission lines if the appropriation is granted.

I have worked very closely with the senior Senator from Oregon on this matter, as I do on all matters affecting the State of Oregon, and I want to assure the Members of the Senate that they can absolutely rely on the representation which the senior Senator from Oregon has made to all concerned in regard to justification of this particular appropriation request.

The senior Senator from Oregon, to my knowledge, has never made an appropriation request for the State of Oregon or any other State that cannot be absolutely justified by the facts.

I, too, wish to assure the Members of the Senate that here is an absolutely deserved and justifiable expenditure of Federal funds. It would be false economy not to grant it. I say that because if this section of the State of Oregon has made available to it Bonneville power, every dollar of cost of these transmission lines will be returned to the economy of the country and to the Treasury many times over, because of the new wealth which would be created by this power development and the new tax dollars which will flow from these wealth-creating projects.

Hence, Mr. President, I strongly urge that the Senate approve of the item in question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was very much interested in this amendment. He is not at this time on the floor, and I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BALL. I suggest that we pass over the amendment temporarily and proceed with the next amendment. I think all the Senator from Oregon wanted to do was to make a statement with reference to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. HILL. I have just received word from the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to proceed and dispose of the amendment to which reference was made a moment ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will revert to the amendment on page 26. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on that page.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the third and last committee amendment on which action remains to be taken.

The amendment was, on page 30, after line 2, to strike out:

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

General administration: For an additional amount for "General Administration," $201,000

Grant to States for public employment offices: For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public employment offices," $9,460,000.

REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

The appropriation "Traveling expenses, Department of Labor, 1948," is hereby reduced by $360,000 and such amount shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 30, beginning on line 3.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, there are three amendments there.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are three amendments which relate to the Department of Labor, but the third one is not necessarily intimately connected with the other two.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the House appropriated $201,000 as an additional amount for general administration of the United States Employment Service. That was stricken out by the first amendment. It also provided $9,406,000 for grants to the States. There was quite a controversy a few weeks ago over the question of where the United States Employment Service should be, whether it should be retained in Washington or should be turned back to the States. It was turned back to the States by action of the Congress. That did not and does not mean that there is not a commanding obligation on the part of the Federal Government in its relationship with the States and with the program of employment, or the limitation or reduction of unemployment. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota to explain why it is that the committee has eliminated all of that appropriation for administrative service and also for grants to the States.

Mr. BALL. I will ask the Senator to yield so that I can make an explanation of what is involved in the three items.

The first item for general administration is $201,000, which is an additional amount for administration of the Farm Placement Service. That service during the war was under the United States Employment Service, under the Wagner-Peyser Act. During the war, as the Senators will recall, by legislation on successive appropriation bills we placed on the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges the task of bringing in from foreign countries needed farm labor and, in addition, operating local farm-placement services in the various States. The legislative authority for that has been

on a calendar-year basis. It will expire on December 31, and the funds of the Extension Service will be expended. Several bills on this subject have been introduced in both Houses, but neither Committee on Agriculture has reported and neither the House nor the Senate has passed a measure to place this service permanently in the Extension Service or to place it permanently in the Department of Labor and the State employment services.

So the House allowed this amount of $201,000 for the Department of Labor's cost of supervising a farm-placement program in the State employment services for the period of 6 months from December 31 to June 30 of next year.

In the grants to States for public employment offices, $1,460,000 of the total of $9,460,000 is for grants to finance the farm-placement service at the State level. In addition to that, the deficiency appropriations subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee increased by $8,000,000 the amount for grants to States for running their regular employment service. The Senate committee struck out that $8,000,000, and struck out the item below, which is a rescission of $360,000 in the appropriation for travel for the Department of Labor, because the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, which went through a long conference, was signed by the President only several weeks ago, and the Appropriations Committee did not like the idea of having the House attempt to change that bill almost before the ink on it was dry. So we wanted to strike out the $8,000,000 increase in grants to States for the regular employment service, as well as the rescission in the travel appropriation; and we wished to take the bill to conference and make the House committee justify the increase.

I think the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security feels that some increase in the grants to States for their regular activities is justified, and something will be done in conference.

The $1,460,000 item, however, and the $201,000 were stricken out by the Senate committee after hearing from the American Farm Bureau, which strongly opposes the return of this farm placement service to the United States Employment Service. I believe that the representatives of the American Farm Bureau testified that they would prefer to have no appropriation and no farm placement service rather than to have it in the United States Employment Service. The committee struck out the item here, and authorized the Senator from Minnesota to move to suspend the rule and to offer an amendment appropriating $1,360,000 to the Extension Service, to continue the farm placement service in the Extension Service for another 6 months.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As chairman of the Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, let me say that we had this item up in connection with the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill. I believe the Senator from Kentucky will recall that we had a colloquy on the floor at that time regarding the matter. If the Senator will recall, during the previous fiscal year there was allotted for grants to States approximately $42,823,000. In the budget $71,728,000 had been recommended, which sum the House had allowed in the bill as passed by it, and it was in the bill as it came to the Senate.

The subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee applied a 20-percent cut to those grants to States. Under the circumstances, inasmuch as the various States had come before the Congress and had asked that that work be turned back to them, and since they said that if it was turned back to them they could perform the service on a more economical basis than the Federal Government could, we did not think it was unreasonable to apply a 20-percent cut; and I have here a series of tables which show that in a good many of the States—I would say in an overwhelming number of them—in the period of time between the time when they previously had the service and the time when it was taken over by the Federal Government and subsequently was returned to them, there was a tremendous growth in the overhead expense, far greater than the growth in the burden they had to carry.

I wish to call to the attention of the able Senator from Kentucky the following language in the Wagner-Peyser Act, which relates to this situation, because there is certainly no question in the minds of the members of the Appropriations Committee, or in the minds of any of us who went into this question, that the amount which shall be allocated to the States is solely and strictly within the hands of the Congress of the United States, and that it would be a bad precedent if we were to let the States start making drafts upon the Federal Treasury merely for the amounts which they might feel they would like to have.

I call attention to section 5, which provides:

> For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and $4,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter, up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938.

Then:

> (3) And thereafter such sums annually as the Congress may deem necessary.

I call to the attention of the able Senator from Kentucky the fact that the Senate allowed, and it was finally accepted in the conference committee, the sum of $57,000,000, as compared with $4,000,000, which a few short years ago the Congress, in passing the act, thought would be reasonable Federal contribution.

I say to the Senator from Kentucky that I believe the proper legislative committee should go into this matter to determine what would be a proper proportion for the Federal Government to contribute to the States and for the States to match.

I believe that it is wrong in principle and is extravagant to have one agency of government, namely, the Federal Government, raise the funds and turn them over to the States, where another agency spends the money, without having worked out some equitable distribution plan or arrangement as to the bearing of the cost.

For that reason, plus the additional fact that the Labor-Federal Security bill has received final action by the Congress only within the last 2 weeks, I do not feel that this additional amount should be provided in a supplemental appropriation.

If the conference committee, in going into this matter, is convinced that some additional funds are needed, I, as chairman of the subcommittee, would have no objection to having a slight additional amount provided. But the purpose was to get this matter into conference and to let them demonstrate the need for whatever additional funds they might wish to have.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it might be well to inform the Members of the Senate of the events leading up to this apparent impasse in the matter of the farm-labor supply. During the war, as all of us know, the Department of Agriculture, through the Extension Service, conducted a very efficient farm-placement program, bringing farm labor in from outside the United States, and also recruiting farm labor from our cities and certain States where there was surplus labor. That was not, at the time it was created, intended to be a permanent program. The USES had authority to place farm workers up to that time, but during the war the work was done almost wholly through the Extension Service.

When the war was over, feeling that something should be done, on the 31st of last March, as I recall the date, Congress enacted legislation continuing the program for the Extension Service up until December 31, 1947. But there was inserted in the bill a proviso that the Employment Service might also place farm labor if it had the opportunity to do so. We did not, however, provide any funds to enable it to do so, so the program as it stands now is with the Extension Service until December 1 of this year.

In June of this year another bill came before the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture which would have made this a permanent program under the Extension Service. The bill was sponsored by the Farm Bureau Federation, I believe, although I am not sure who sponsored it. At any rate, the Farm Bureau Federation and other farm organizations testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture. The Farm Bureau Federation indicated, as has been stated, that they were determined that this work should be carried on by the Extension Service. The other farm organizations were against fixing it in the Extension Service, but merely asked that it be placed with the Department of Agriculture. Both sides were so set that it appeared that whichever way the committee wrote the bill finally and brought it to the floor of the Senate there would be opposition. I might say, too, in this respect, that none of the farm organiza-

tions covered themselves with glory. None of them expressed any willingness to meet the others half way in an effort to draft a bill which would be fair to all.

A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was appointed to see if a bill could be perfected, and, as I have said, we found both sides adamant, the Farm Bureau Federation on the one side, the other farm organizations on the other, neither willing to give an inch. Before the subcommittee could work out a bill the House Committee on Agriculture shelved the bill completely and said they were not going to take any action on it this year. That left the situation in this shape: The present program under the Extension Service will expire December 31 of this year. The employment services of the States have authority to place farm workers, but they have no money unless some is appropriated in the pending bill.

Apparently the Farm Bureau Federation has persuaded the Committee on Appropriations to strike out any appropriation for the purpose of placing farm labor with the Employment Service. The result may be that there will be no farm placement service whatsoever the coming year, due to the fact that the farm organizations have spent greater effort in fighting against each other than in trying to get together and work out a program on which they could agree.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that the program as administered by the Extension Service has been very well handled. It has given satisfaction generally to the farmers of the country. It is quite likely that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate might have brought out a bill which would have placed it with the Extension Service, although I am not sure as to that. The committee itself was divided. The fact remains, however, that unless some appropriation is made to the Employment Service, or something is done to relieve the situation, there will be no farm placement service at all this year.

There is no assurance that the House will accept the provision which is proposed to be offered to the bill making an appropriation in the neighborhood of a million and a half dollars for the Extension Service, rather than run the risk of having no placement service for the farmers whatsoever.

I should like to see some appropriation made for the Employment Service so that there may be assurance of some service to the farm people in the matter of getting help. Even though it may not be the very best, it will be much better than nothing at all, and it looks to me as if we will get nothing at all unless we make some appropriation for the Employment Service.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I have not the floor, but I yield so far as I can.

Mr. PEPPER. In connection with what the Senator from Vermont has said, there is already basic authority for the United States Employment Service.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. And the House has appropriated funds to enable the United States Employment Service to function in the general field of employment, including agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. That is also correct.

Mr. PEPPER. There was enacted by the last Congress a limitation upon the emergency war program, to make it expire December 31 of this year.

Mr. AIKEN. That action was taken by this Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. I should have said that the enactment was by this Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the limitation was the 31st of March.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and, if so, to whom? To the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama to ask the Senator from Vermont a question.

Mr. HILL. On April 28, 1947, the 28th of the past April, about 90 days ago, Public Law 46, Eightieth Congress, which was House bill 2102, an act to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor supply program, and for other purposes, became the law.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. HILL. The first section reads:

Be it enacted, etc., That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, 78th Cong., 2d sess., title I), as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions relating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section 5 (g) of such act, may be continued up to and including December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within 30 days.

In other words, the present Congress, some 90 days ago, put an end to the temporary status of the Farm Employment Service, and let the Farm Employment Service go back where it was originally put by the basic act creating the employment services, farm service and city and other services. So we acted 90 days ago.

The act makes it very clear that if the law is permitted to stand as Congress intended it to stand some 90 days ago, the Extension Service will continue to play its part in the farm labor employment program, because the act provides, in subparagraph (b) of section 2:

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges—

That is, the Extension Service about which we are speaking—

and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

In other words, this whole question was settled by Congress about 90 days ago, and settled by substantive law, as it should have been settled, settled by legislation reported from the appropriate legislative committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the action of the House in providing the money is in furtherance and fulfillment of the basic legislative policy of the Congress.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. The House shelved the bill which would have continued the placement program under the Extension Service exclusively. Therefore, I do not like to take the chance of having no service at all.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will yield, the House has definitely shelved that bill and said there shall be no bill. That is true, is it not; certainly so far as this Congress is concerned?

Mr. AIKEN. The House Committee on Agriculture voted to shelve the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the situation is clear. Under the basic Wagner-Peyser Act, the service was placed in the United States Employment Service. While the war continued it was transferred by Executive order to the Department of Agriculture. It was, as the Senator from Vermont has said, on a year-to-year basis. I think the Senator from Minnesota agrees to that. We did, from year to year, by appropriation bill, provide for taking care of that service while it was in the Department of Agriculture. Under Public, No. 40, which was passed at this session of the Congress, as the Senator from Alabama has already indicated and as the Senator from Vermont has indicated, the service in the Department of Agriculture is terminated on December 31 next; so it will not be there. It automatically goes back, under the Organic Act, or under the Wagner-Peyser Act, to the United States Employment Service. The Senator from Minnesota has in prospect an amendment, upon which I understand he will seek suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds vote, to put this service in the Department of Agriculture permanently. On the 31st of December, if we do not appropriate any money for the service to be carried on in the United States Employment Service and the law terminates as to the Agricultural Department, as the Senator from Vermont says, there will be no service anywhere, and the function will terminate automatically by lapse of the law. The legislation which is involved, in part at least, in the amendment the Senator from Minnesota will offer, has been considered by the Agricultural Committees of both the House and the Senate. Both have up to now—and if we adjourn tomorrow, that means, of course, it will be for this session—declined to report to either House legislation transferring the service permanently to the Extension Service in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senate subcommittee, appointed to consider the matter, saw no use in continuing its efforts after the House had definitely said "We are not going to permit the bill, placing this with the Extension Service, to come to the floor." If the House Agricultural Committee would not approve it, we knew full well that the House as a whole would not do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of what the House Committee on Agriculture has done, the House has included the appropriations which the Senate committee has stricken out. If the three amendments are adopted, and if they should be agreed to in conference, there would be no funds for the administration of this service, either in the Department of Agriculture or in the Labor Department, or in the United States Employment Service; that is correct, is it not?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that, Mr. President, I think all the amendments on this subject should be rejected, so that this service may continue to operate.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. In a moment. Reference has been made to the Farm Bureau Federation, for which I have the greatest respect, and of which I am an active member, qualified, and all that, as a farmer. I have had a communication from my very dear friend, for whom I have affection and regard, Mr. Edward O'Neal, in regard to this matter; but the farmers are not unanimous in regard to it. I have a very strong communication from those who are assisting to administer the law and to carry out the program of the Congress in my own State, asking that it be left in the United States Employment Service rather than be thrown into controversy as to whether it should be permanently transferred to the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The farm organizations, other than the Farm Bureau Federation, asked that it be placed with the Department of Agriculture, but they were insistent that the Department of Agriculture be not bound to operate through the Extension Service. It was unfortunate that there was a division among the farm groups. The responsibility, if there is no service at all, will largely fall upon them.

I think the program has been splendidly administered by the Extension Service; I presume better than it would be through the USES, which has not had the farm experience the Extension Service has had. I, too, have admiration for the Farm Bureau. I was a Farm Bureau member for a long, long time before Ed O'Neal was, and I have been ever since; but I think the organizations have not performed the service for their members that they should have, as a result of being so adamant.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot claim to have been a member that long, because I am not that old.

Mr. AIKEN. I was not old enough to join, when I joined.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Kentucky in the position which he takes about the amendments. I think the vice of the matter is that if the amendments are adopted, and if then the amendment is adopted which is later to be offered, to provide an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, we would be permitting the Appropriations Committee to legislate, and we would be grafting legislation on the appropriation bill. It is legislation which the Agricultural Committees of both the House and Senate have declined to pass. I think it would be an unfortunate situation to have the Appropriations Committee inaugurate legislation to supplant the existing law, and the determination of this matter by the Agricultural Committees of the House and Senate. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has very properly said that the Senate Agriculture Committee considered three bills, one of them to deal with this matter as it now is; another to leave it in the Department of Agriculture, which would set up a different organization; and the third, to put it in the USES. It seems to me the matter ought to be determined in a regular and orderly way by the committee whose authority and jurisdiction it is to determine it. That would mean the Agriculture Committee. We already have a law, as the Senator from Alabama pointed out, that will take care of this situation, if the appropriation is permitted to remain; but if the amendment is adopted, which is to be offered in lieu of the amendments stricken out, striking out the amount that goes to the Employment Service, then, of course, it would be transferred to the agricultural fund. The agricultural fund operates on a calendar-year basis. This would extend it to June 30 of next year, on the fiscal basis. Therefore, in the middle of the year, we would have a program probably terminating or changing from one agency to another. It seems to me it is not a good idea and it is not good policy to have the Appropriations Committee inaugurate legislation which the two Agricultural Committees of the House and Senate have declined to pass. On the other hand, they passed legislation authorizing the extension of the present service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. His objection to the elimination of the appropriation is extremely valid, as is his objection to the effort on the floor of the Senate, in the closing days of this Congress, on an appropriation bill, to determine a matter that has been before the Agricultural Committees of both the House and Senate in this session, which they have not determined as yet.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I wonder if I could suggest a way in which this matter could be settled in a hurry.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is one of the objections we were making.

Mr. BALL. I may say that I share the views of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that.

Mr. BALL. My personal view is that this service should be in the United States Employment Service; that there should be one employment service instead of two.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that the Senator shares my view. I appreciate it. That confirms me in my belief that I am correct.

Mr. BALL. I suggest that we would settle the issue very rapidly if I should ask unanimous consent that we temporarily pass over the pending committee amendments so that I may then move to suspend the rule pursuant to notice given, to offer the amendment which is on Senators' desks, which would provide an appropriation for the Extension Service. Obviously if we cannot secure two-thirds to suspend the rule to do that, then the committee amendment should be rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to laying the amendments aside temporarily so as to take up the Senator's amendment, upon which there must be a two-thirds affirmative vote in order that it may be considered.

I may suggest to the Senator that if he fails to secure the two-thirds, then the appropriation may be restored.

Mr. BALL. I think it should then be restored, though not the whole amount of $9,460,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the circumstances I do not object to the suggestion that the amendments be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the pending amendments be temporarily laid aside so that he may propose a motion. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make a very brief statement regarding the whole problem, because it is very apparently a controversial issue in my State. I have been deluged by representatives on both sides of the issue, by farm leaders in my State, and I do not want to appear to the farm leaders in my State as unwilling to take a position in regard to the matter. In fact, I think it would surprise them if I do not take a position on the matter. Hence, I sought, Mr. President, to try to find out what the facts are in regard to the matter, because I at least wanted to put into the RECORD a statement of facts as I was able to find them. So I asked the USES to give me some material on the basis of which I could prepare a memorandum. It will take me but a brief time to present the memorandum. I think it ought to be in the RECORD from the standpoint of having in the RECORD at least a statement of historical brief on this problem.

Mr. President, I am opposed to amending H. R. 4269 to continue the farm-labor-supply program in the Department of Agriculture through June 30, 1948. This proposal constitutes substantive legislation and is contrary to the general practice of this body that substantive legislation should not be included in appropriation measures.

Moreover, Mr. President, the proposal flies in the face of previous actions only recently taken by both the House and the Senate, as referred to a few minutes ago by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. After extensive hearings before the appropriate House and Senate committees, Public Law 40 was approved on April 28 of this year. That law provides that the emergency farm-labor-supply program hitherto administered by the Department of Agriculture shall

be liquidated on December 31, 1947. It also provides that during the interim, the United States Employment Service and the affiliated State services shall not be limited in carrying on farm-labor recruitment and placement activities originally provided for by the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933. The proposal to amend the bill now before us would continue the farm-labor-supply program in the Department of Agriculture until June 30, 1948, and contradicts the recently expressed will of the Congress.

Within the past few weeks both the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture held hearings on identical bills which proposed to transfer farm placement responsibility permanently to the Department of Agriculture. It was the view of that House committee that there is no justification for maintaining duplicate employment office facilities and that the responsibility for farm placement activity properly belongs with the public employment service.

I think that is especially true, Mr. President, in view of the fact that this service now falls within the jurisdiction of the States. If we do not have confidence in keeping with the general principle which would cause us to transfer this service to the States, if we do not have confidence in our State officials, Mr. President, who are certainly very close to the farm leaders and the farmers of their respective States, then I do not know in whom we can place confidence.

Neither the Senate nor House committee has seen fit to report the bill favorably.

BRIEF HISTORY AND STATUS OF THE FARM PLACEMENT SERVICE OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT SERVICE SYSTEM

Public Law 40, passed by the Eightieth Congress, approved April 28, 1947, provides for the liquidation of the emergency-farm-labor program in the Department of Agriculture and resumption of the Farm Placement Service by the United States Employment Service on January 1, 1948. This law was passed after extended hearings by the Committee on Agriculture as to the timing of the transfer back to the USES.

The proposed legislation in H. R. 3367 raises a new issue: Whether the public employment service system is to be dismembered by permanent transfer out of the USES of the Farm Placement Service. This issue was decided in 1933 when legislation was passed to provide services to all segments of the labor market in one over-all system, which is the USES and its affiliated State employment services. I emphasize the State employment service. In my judgment at least they are now the primary administrative force dealing with these employment problems. The decision that there should be one system (rather than a number of services) has remained the will of Congress.

The farm placement function was temporarily delegated by the War Manpower Commission during the war to the Department of Agriculture because the war emergency required in connection with farm placement extraordinary activities beyond those of peacetime service—for instance, transportation and housing activities.

The proposed legislation in H. R. 4269 would repeal Public Law 40, and would be the first step in the dismemberment of the public employment service system. In order for the Farm Placement Service to remain a specialized service of the over-all system no legislation in addition to Public Law 40 is needed.

FARM PLACEMENT SERVICE AFTER WORLD WAR I

Following World War I, there was maintained by the United States Department of Labor through the intervening years prior to the enactment of the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933, in varying degrees throughout the country a semblance of a Farm Placement Service to employers and workers in the harvesting of wheat, particularly in the State of Kansas. Later this very limited service was extended to the cotton-growing areas of States immediately to the west of the Mississippi River. During that period the personnel of this farm placement assistance and the activity were maintained on a bare minimum, in fact a skeletonized basis.

THE WAGNER-PEYSER ACT

With the passage of the Wagner-Peyser Act of June 6, 1933, specific provisions were established "to maintain a Farm Placement Service." As the USES, working with the States, encouraged and developed a Nation-wide system of free public employment offices, there began, on a very modest scale, the development of a Farm Placement Service. By the year 1935 a small but identifiable service had been established.

This nucleus began an effective program by the spring of 1936. Its effectiveness was the result of learning that the Farm Placement Service is a specialized function of the employment offices, which requires a knowledge of all acreages planted to crops in every county in every State, along with a knowledge of the average yield, and accurate estimates of the labor requirement for each activity related to crop production and harvesting. As time went on, the farm placement program within the USES and the State employment services accumulated know-how of anticipated labor supply and demand information in agricultural areas, the type, kind, and number of workers who voluntarily move from area to area, and the most effective means for recruiting workers in labor surplus areas for use in areas needing more workers.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE FARM PLACEMENT SERVICE

The placement figures indicate the development of the Farm Placement Service within the USES. In 1935 the Farm Placement Service made approximately 200,000 farm-labor placements, or so the people in the USES assure me. By 1937 such placements had increased to half a million; by 1940, to a million and a half, and in 1942 to 3,300,000. It must be kept in mind that during the period 1935 to 1940 in many areas there was widespread unemployment. It was as big a job to intelligently direct and advise workers following the crop harvests on the probable demand for workers as it was to recruit workers. This was necessary in order to prevent, to the extent possible, movement of workers into an area in such numbers that employment was not available to them and which oftentimes resulted in a heavy relief burden on the community because the workers became stranded.

TRANSFER OF THE FARM PLACEMENT SERVICE

In 1943, when the USES was the operating arm of the War Manpower Commission, WMC Directive 17 transferred the farm-placement function of the USES to the War Food Administrator, as a war-emergency measure in order for farm-labor recruitment for the duration of the emergency to be augmented by a transportation- and camp-facilities program. Following its transfer to the War Food Administrator in the Department of Agriculture, the emergency farm-labor program was transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture and the program was divided into two parts: (1) domestic labor and (2) foreign labor and camp program. The domestic-labor function was assigned to the Federal Extension Service and to the State extension services of the land grant colleges. The foreign labor and camp portion became the labor branch of the Production and Marketing Administration.

Facts repudiate criticisms at this time leveled at the farm-placement program within the USES. Even after the farm-placement function had beer transferred to the Department of Agriculture, during the year 1943 the Department of Agriculture and its State affiliates requested the USES to continue to carry this funtion under reimbursable agreements in 28 States. In addition, in many of the States where no agreements were made, the local employment offices continued to serve agricultural employers and workers.

RETURN OF FARM-PLACEMENT SERVICE TO THE USES

In the fall of 1945 at the annual meeting of the Executive Committee of Land Grant Colleges, this group discussed with the Secretary of Agriculture the status of this emergency responsibility which had been delegated to them during the war. At that time they stated that they desired to be relieved of this responsibility, because they felt it interfered with their basic function of extension education in agriculture. As a result of this feeling expressed by land-grant college representatives, a small committee was appointed for the purpose of reviewing this assignment and to determine what recommendation should be made to the Secretary relative thereto. This committee gave a report to the Secretary of Agriculture in the spring of 1946 from which the Secretary's office developed a draft memorandum addressed to the President of the United States requesting that the Farm-Placement Service be returned to the USES. This proposed letter was discussed with the Director of the USES in the latter part of June 1946. As resumption of the Farm-Placement Service by the USES required advance planning the two agencies agreed that it would probably be wise to allow the emergency farm-labor program to continue in the Department of Agriculture during the remainder of 1946, and in

the interim period to work out an orderly transfer between the agencies to assure no break in the service to farmer-employers and to workers.

The two agencies after agreeing upon this approach immediately began a series of conferences to effectuate the decision reached.

Shortly after the Eightieth Congress convened, while the Employment Service was preparing a budget estimate to cover its resumption of the Farm Placement Service, H. R. 2102, February 19, 1947, was introduced. After full hearings by the Congress, this bill became Public Law 40, April 28, 1947. By this law the Congress decided that the emergency farm labor program in the Department of Agriculture should be liquidated by the end of the calendar year 1947. Section 2a of this law recognizes the responsibility of the USES. In view of the language of Public Law 40, the USES and its affiliated State employment services are proceeding with plans for resuming this basic responsibility in the system of the public employment offices, which has been one of the major functions of the Employment Service since enactment of the Wagner-Peyser Act in 1933.

In the light of the desire of Congress to eliminate peacetime overlapping and duplication of functions of agencies, Public Law 40 assures that the present duplication of Employment Service facilities will be eliminated. The Farm Placement Service as a part of the over-all Employment Service program of the USES and its affiliated State employment services provides to agricultural employers and workers alike a continuing placement service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a memorandum headed "Facts regarding Farm Placement Service."

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS REGARDING FARM PLACEMENT SERVICE

1. EMERGENCY LOCATION OF PROGRAM

The farm labor program was assigned to the Department of Agriculture as an emergency measure during the war, the basic legislation having remained unchanged in the Wagner-Peyser act. (United States Employment Service and affiliated State employment services.)

2. RECENT ACTIVITY CONCERNING EMERGENCY FARM LABOR PROGRAM

This program has been extended by appropriation on three separate occasions, the most recent of which was Public Law 40 which was passed in April and provided for final liquidation of the program December 31, 1947, and return of the function of farm placement to the United States Employment Service.

3. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The House and Senate Committees have just recently considered legislation (hearings on S. 1334 and H. R. 3367) which proposed to set up the farm placement program permanently in the Department of Agriculture and has rejected this legislation, leaving the basic authority of the Wagner-Peyser Act which requires that the United States Employment Service and affiliated State Employment Services maintain the farm placement service.

4. BUDGETARY ACTION

The House Appropriations Committee reviewed and approved the supplemental budget request which provides $1,460,000 for grants to States and $201,000 for the administrative expenses of the USES in resuming on January 1, 1948, the responsibility for the farm placement service.

5. THE INSERTION OF SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE IN PLACE OF APPROPRIATION REQUEST IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL BILL H. R. 4269

The deletion of this money from the present appropriation measure being considered by the Senate and the substitution of language to continue the farm placement program in the Department of Agriculture, (1) proposes substantive language in an appropriation measure, and (2) such action in this instance is in direct contradiction to the will of Congress as expressed in Public Law 40, of this Congress.

Such language would again provide a 6 months' extension of the emergency farm labor program which would again extend the problem of transferring the program back where it belongs into the middle of another crop year. A transfer of the function at that time would be disruptive—it would not be disruptive to transfer the program on January 1.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have made this statement of a historical review of the development of the Farm Placement Service because I think the farmers of my State and the farm leaders of my State, who do not seem to be in agreement with regard to the issue now before the Senate, at least ought to have available to them what I believe to be the historical facts regarding the development of this service.

With that statement in the RECORD, I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, unanimous consent is granted, and the Senator from Minnesota may present his further suggestion.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, pursuant to notice given under rule XL, I now move to suspend the rule so that I may offer an amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

FARM-LABOR-SUPPLY PROGRAM

Supply and distribution of farm labor: That part of the authority and funds with respect to providing an adequate supply of workers for the production, harvesting, and preparation for markets of agricultural commodities by the recruitment and placement of domestic agricultural workers as provided by the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act of 1944, as amended and supplemented, are hereby continued through June 30, 1948, and in addition to the amount hereby continued available, there is hereby appropriated the sum of $1,350,000 for such purposes, to be merged with the funds hereby continued available: *Provided*, That not less than $1,250,000 of such additional funds shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner and for the purposes specified in section 2 of said act: *Provided further*, That (except as provided in Public Law 40, 80th Cong.) no part of the funds appropriated or heretofore appropriated shall be available for the payment of transportation, housing, or subsistence of agricultural workers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not necessary that a point of order be made against the amendment before the motion to suspend the rule can be made?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Except as a point of order is made, the question about the suspension of the rule does not arise.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

The question now is, Shall the rule be suspended for the purpose of considering the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]?

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Baldwin	Hawkes	Murray
Ball	Hayden	Myers
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brewster	Hill	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota to suspend the rule.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Minnesota. We have a farm labor problem in my State, particularly in connection with the harvesting of soft and hard fruits. According to the information I receive from the State of Washington, there will be needed this fall a certain amount of Mexican labor which has always been imported to handle the fruit crop, because, as the Senator knows, it has to be done quickly. How would the amendment affect that situation?

Mr. BALL. It would not affect it this fall at all. As the law now applies, the Farm Placement Service which is now under the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture, will, on January 17, revert to the United States Employ-

ment Service in the Department of Labor, in the various States. I have moved to suspend the rule, on behalf of the committee, so that I can offer an amendment which is subject to a point of order, which will continue it for another 6 months in the Extension Service. Then we shall go back to the language of the House bill. The House put in an appropriation so that the service would be transferred on January 1, and there is an item of $201,000 for the United States Employment Service.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Insofar as this fall is concerned, the situation remains the same as it is. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I should like to have an expression from the Senator from Minnesota as to the future of the farm camps. They have been very helpful in Virginia and, I understand, elsewhere. I have been informed that the amendment affects that situation, because, in any event, at the end of the calendar year such camps will be discontinued and the camp properties disposed of. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

The other day we passed a bill providing for the disposal of those camps, which were set up primarily to take care of labor imported from Mexico and Jamaica. That program terminates on January 1; and the amendment for which I am seeking suspension of the rule, on behalf of the committee, merely continues and makes available funds so that the Extension Service can operate the local employment offices in the various States to recruit labor within the States primarily for the farms.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to ask another question. The Farm Bureau Federation takes the position that the Extension Service and the county agents, who operate under the Extension Service, do a better job for the farmers than is done by the Employment Service of the Federal Government and the employment services of the States. I have been told that the House is so much opposed to continuing funds for the operation of the service by the Federal Government under this program that if we now vote for the Senator's proposed amendment to continue the operation under the Extension Service we shall have the principle without any funds with which to operate it. I should like to have an expression as to that point.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if the rule is suspended and if the amendment is adopted, then the whole question will be in conference, because the House appropriated the funds to the Department of Labor, and if the Senate adopts this amendment it will appropriate the funds to the Department of Agriculture's Extension Service. The conferees would agree on putting the funds in either one place or the other, I should think. So there is no danger of being without any appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is there any danger that if we take action today on the Senator's amendment, the result will be a failure to appropriate any funds at all for the operation of this Service after the end of this year?

Mr. BALL. No; there is no danger of that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder whether there was any testimony before the committee or whether the Senator has any information regarding the treaties with Mexico and with other countries, and whether all those treaties have been culminated and whether the quotas have been exhausted.

Mr. BALL. They were not treaties. They were agreements for the importation of farm labor, and the agreements terminate on January 1.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But so far as the Senator from Minnesota knows, for this fall the treaties or conventions have been made; have they?

Mr. BALL. The agreements have been made; yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question, if he will yield to me.

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I hold in my hand a telegraphic message which I received in Washington on July 23 from Mr. Michael J. Carroll, who, as I recall, is director of the State Employment Service. He signs the message as "Director."

His message reads as follows—and I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he has any comment on the point made in the message by Mr. Carroll:

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *July 23, 1947.*

Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL,
Senator, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Received word that Senate subcommittee has stricken from omnibus appropriation bill appropriation for local farm placement and has also set up inhibition against return of farm placement to States until June 1948, contrary to Public Law 40. We have entered into agreement to carry on limited farm placement activity under arrangement between labor and agriculture as directed by Public Law 40. Complete farm placement can be accomplished by this State on early return of the activity with reasonable funds. The Missouri State Employment Service is best equipped to perform this activity. Continued restriction and overlapping authority on farm placement retards placement of veterans and other labor with farm employers, resulting in inadequate exposure of readjustment and unemployment compensation claimants to job opportunities.

MICHAEL J. CARROLL,
Director.

I should like very much to have the Senator give us his views with respect to the point thus presented by Mr. Carroll.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the amendment which I shall offer on behalf of the committee, if the rule is suspended, is the one to which the correspondent of the Senator is objecting in that communication. The committee felt that this service should remain in the Department of Agriculture until June 30, 1948, so as to give the legislative committees one more chance to determine the issue finally.

It is the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota as an individual Senator, not speaking for the committee, that the basic argument made by the Senator's correspondent is correct, and that we should have only one employment service in the State, namely, one coordinated with the Unemployment Compensation Division.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask a further brief question, with the Senator's permission. I have received a telephone message from another gentleman in whom I have much confidence because of his great familiarity with employment service and unemployment compensation matters. He takes the following position, in the course of his message, which I shall not read in extensio—in one sentence:

Referral of agricultural labor should be made by the same agency making referrals to commercial and industrial employment and coordinated with unemployment compensation.

I gather from the Senator's comments that he regards as correct the position thus taken by the gentleman who has telephoned my office. Do I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to repeat the statement I previously made, although perhaps I should make a brief statement at this point, in view of the fact that some Members of the Senate have entered the Chamber since we discussed this matter a while ago.

The House Appropriations Committee approved the appropriation for this service as it is now. The motion to suspend the rule, filed by the Senator from Minnesota, is for the purpose of making in order the offering of an amendment to change that situation, so that this matter would go into conference with greater controversy as between the two Houses with regard to this service for this fiscal year. It really does not affect anything except the last half of the fiscal year. As was stated a while ago, it really affects only the last half of the fiscal year beginning the first of January, because it is not to be disturbed for the other 6 months of this year.

The House appropriated $210,000 for administrative purposes and approximately $9,600,000 for grants to States. It has been stricken out by the committee, but at least a portion of it will be restored if the amendment which it is the purpose of the Senator from Minnesota to offer is not agreed to and if the motion to suspend the rule is not agreed to.

It seems to me that under the conditions which now exist, the wisest thing to do is to defeat the motion to suspend the rule, and to accept the House appropriation for this fiscal year.

Both Agricultural Committees of the House and Senate have turned down what is now attempted to be done.

Mr. President, this is legislation on an appropriation bill. If the motion is defeated and if the amendment is not permitted to be offered and if the House provision is retained, that will simplify the

matter insofar as the conferees are concerned, whereas to adopt the motion to suspend the rule and to adopt the amendment would, I am afraid, create such controversy and confusion between the two Houses that we might run a great risk of injuring the Service, no matter where it may be put for this fiscal year.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, does the Senator from Kentucky believe that we shall run more risk of losing the fund for this year if we adopt the motion to suspend the rule and thereafter adopt the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota intends to offer if the rule is suspended?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do. I do not say that we would lose it, but I would say we would run a greater risk of losing it than we would with the bill as sent to us by the House of Representatives.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Does the Senator from Kentucky understand that the House committee is trying to work out a plan?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Agriculture Committees of both Houses have had this problem before them all this session. They have declined to do anything. It is a matter of legislation. They will have the remainder of this session and this fiscal year in which to work out a program that will be permanent law.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I believe many farmers in Virginia and elsewhere would like to see the work done by the Extension Service, but I understand that the House would not agree to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. They have not done so, and they have declined to report a bill of that sort. Therefore, that multiplies the difficulties between the House and the Senate in connection with an appropriation bill at this stage of the session.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota is legislation on an appropriation bill, is it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is.

Mr. OVERTON. And it is legislation, is it not, which should be handled by the Agriculture Committees as such?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. They have had it before them, and have not acted on it. They have declined to take any action up to now.

Mr. OVERTON. As the junior Senator from Virginia states, the people in Louisiana prefer to have the Agricultural Department handle the matter, but under the circumstances I think the Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Has the Senator been advised, as I have been, that the committee on the House side not only has not acted affirmatively in reporting a bill, but by affirmative vote in the committee has tabled the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the true situation. I did not care to make the statement quite that strong, but that has happened. They have considered the matter, and not only declined to act affirmatively, but up to now they have killed the legislation by tabling it. So the amendment seeks to do on an appropriation bill what at least the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has declined to do, and what the House committee has refused to do by tabling the legislative proposal involved in the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator feel, as does the Senator from Oregon, that were the question purely an undecided question, as I understand it was, now, so far as the House Legislative Committee considering the legislation is concerned, that committee has affirmatively refused to recommend the legislation, and in effect acted adversely upon it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORDON. That has changed my position.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator a question. It is correct, is it not, that in the States the theory of the coordination of the unemployment compensation and the employment services, at least in part, is that when a man applies for unemployment compensation he should be first given the opportunity, and, in the second place, required to use reasonable efforts to avail himself of the opportunity to secure employment before he can secure unemployment compensation. That is the theory of the coordination of the two functions?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. If a man should go to an unemployment-compensation office and should say that he was a farmer and would like to work on a farm, would it not be advisable that the same agency which handles the employment referrals of men who come in and say they would like to work in factories, should be the same agency which handles referrals to farms?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think so, and that is evidently a strong reason why the House committee has turned down the legislation, and why the Senate committee has not acted upon it. It certainly is an inconvenience for a man to go to an employment office seeking a job on a farm, and be told that there is another agency that handles his case. It certainly seems to be in the interest of efficiency and coordination for such a man to find out what he can get and what his rights are at the place which he visits for that purpose, and which is advertised and held out by our Government and by the State governments as the place for him to go.

Mr. DONNELL. I take it, therefore, that the Senator would agree that ultimately, at any rate, there should be invested in the employment service, as definitely as in some other branch or agency, the referral of men for agricultural employment, as well as industrial employment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am very much inclined to that belief.

Mr. DONNELL. If I do not unduly trespass on the Senator's time, may I ask him with respect to the same sentence which I presented to the Senator from Minnesota, and ask whether he would agree with this view:

> Referral of agricultural labor should be made by the same agency making referrals to commercial and industrial employment and coordinated with unemployment compensation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is a sound suggestion, and, unless I were convinced pretty strongly to the contrary, I would adhere to it.

Mr. DONNELL. The gentleman who called my office on the telephone made this point. He said:

> If the Agricultural Placement Service is operated in conjunction with State employment offices a saving of at least one-half of the cost of that Service will result. Duplication of facilities and personnel result from the separate operation of the Agricultural Placement Service.

I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky if he agrees, generally speaking, with the observation made by this correspondent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think obviously that would be the result. There would be greater economy and efficiency, but beyond all that, I think it is a problem which we should leave to the legislative committees until they have been able to determine what permanently shall be done with this agency, without trying to do it on an appropriation bill, which at best would be only temporary.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this entire question was before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was given a great deal of study and thought by the committee. We agreed, as a committee, that we would extend the service to December 31, 1947, and it was so recommended to the Senate. I think the entire question will need further study later.

There is a concern in the minds of the farm people that in the event this service is taken from the Extension Service and placed in the USES, it will be in an office too far removed from the producing group, and the Extension Service, having representatives in every county, has given the service closer cooperation in connection with the employment question. So far as the question we are considering today is concerned, it will be administered up to December 31 of this year, and then I think the entire question needs to be reexamined and it should be determined what shall be done about the problem.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in committee I was in favor of the legislation, and so voted, in the belief, based on the information I had at that time, that the question was still being considered and was undetermined in the Agricultural Committees of the two Houses. That being the case, it appeared to be altogether reasonable that we adopt the legislation, and maintain the farm employment recruitment in the Extension Service, where it has been highly satisfactorily handled, so far as recruitment of labor for agriculture is concerned, until such time as the committees might determine the legislative question.

However, since that vote was taken I have been advised that the House Committee on Agriculture has acted in the premises, and has acted adversely to the

continuation of the Employment Service in the Extension Service. I hope that we may have in USES, if farm-labor recruitment is to be placed there, more affirmative action than that agency has heretofore evidenced in the handling of the employment problem. Referral of labor is not sufficient. While this activity was in the hands of the Extension Service, there was a campaign of active recruitment of farm labor, not simply referral of the unemployed, but an affirmative seeking of farm labor and a placement of such labor where it was needed. I can see no reason why the same type of affirmative action cannot be had under the State agency which takes care of other unemployment cases. I realize that an affirmative program must be worked out if the needs of agriculture for its seasonal labor are to be fully met.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it would seem to me that if the principles to which both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Minnesota have agreed in the last few minutes—and possibly earlier this morning; I do not know—are sound, as they agreed they are sound, namely, that the referrals of agricultural labor should be made by the same agency making the referrals to commercial and industrial employment, coordinated with unemployment compensation, if the agricultural placement service acted in conjunction with State employment offices, a very substantial saving would result, whereas duplication of facilities and personnel results from the separate operation of the agricultural placement service.

I say, Mr. President, it seems to me that if those are sound principles, and both Senators have so agreed, the logical procedure for the Senate in my judgment would be to reject the motion made by the Senator from Minnesota to suspend the rule; and, in the second place, at the appropriate time, to reinstate in the bill the portion stricken out on page 30, which relates to the financing of the United States Employment Service. So, Mr. President, I submit, first, that the action to be taken should be to reject the motion to suspend the rule, and, in the second place, to take the further step of reinstating into the bill an adequate provision of a financial nature, for the United States Employment Service.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HILL. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator in what he says about cooperation. I should like to call his attention to the provision in the act of April 28, 1947, which was passed less than 90 days ago, providing for the Farm Employment Service to be returned to where it originally was, together with the State employment services. That act, subsection (b) of section 2, reads as follows:

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

In other words, the Congress, by the act of April 28, 1947, sought to write in strong language the very thought expressed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, that there shall be cooperation, and that maximum use shall be made of the Agricultural Extension Services of the land-grant colleges.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Alabama for calling attention to the provision. It seems to me it is perfectly clear that if a man goes to the Unemployment Compensation office desiring unemployment compensation, since the question as to whether he is entitled to it is dependent at least in large part on whether or not he can get a job, he should be offered the opportunity at the most effective place to get that job, whatever job he may want. Therefore, it seems to me that the logical place for the administration of this function of offering agricultural employment is the agency which handles commercial and industrial employment.

Attention is called to the experience shown by a statement made by a gentleman who called my office in regard to the matter. I quote substantially from his statement:

Now the agricultural placement service being operated by the Department of Agriculture benefit claimants are not being referred to agricultural work. First, because agricultural job orders are not placed with the State public employment service but with the county agent of the Agricultural Extension Service and, second, because no funds are available for the States to operate agricultural placement services.

Continuing, he says:

There are approximately one million workers who move between agricultural work and industrial employment and such claimants should be exposed to agricultural work in testing their eligibility for employment benefits.

He concludes this portion of his message with this significant sentence:

Innumerable unemployment claims are now being paid unnecessarily because this cannot be done.

I think, Mr. President, if I can for the moment get away from the more or less abstract language of the message to a specific illustration, that if I am out of a job and go to the unemployment compensation office in my State, and ask for unemployment compensation, and if I am told, "We do not find anything in a factory or a commercial institution for you," and they stop there; then I am entitled to unemployment compensation. But if they further state to me, "We will now see if we can obtain a job for you working on a farm," obviously to the extent that they are able to secure farm employment for me, my claim against the unemployment compensation fund will be reduced. So it seems to me perfectly logical, as my informant says, that "Innumerable unemployment claims are now being paid unnecessarily because this cannot be done," because there is no exposure, as he calls it, to agricultural work "in testing their eligibility for unemployment benefits." So, Mr. President, again I insist that appropriate action to be taken by the Senate at this time is to refuse to suspend the rule, and, thereafter, to reinstate in this bill the provision, or at least an adequate provision, for the United States Employment Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota to suspend the rule for the indicated purpose.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in view of the vote, I suggest that the Senate reject the first amendment on page 30, namely, the item of $201,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move to modify the second committee amendment, by reinstating the language, but changing the amount to $1,460,000. That is the amount for the Farm Placement Service. The other $8,000,000 was an increase of grants to States, which the chairman of the committee that handled the regular bill has requested us to make them justify in conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I want to be sure that I correctly understand the action just now taken. Did the Senator say that $1,460,000 will provide in his judgment for the placement of farm labor?

Mr. BALL. It is the amount earmarked in both the House and Senate committee reports for the Farm Placement Service.

Mr. DONNELL. And may I inquire, what is the $8,000,000, which in addition to the $1,460,000, makes up the item of $9,460,000 in the House bill?

Mr. BALL. That is the over-all increase in the grants to States for operating their employment services, which is an increase over an amount agreed upon in a bill which the Senate passed about 2 weeks ago. The chairman of the subcommittee that handled the bill asked us to strike that out and to take it to conference, and make the House justify it.

Mr. DONNELL. If it is a fair question, Mr. President, the Senator does not consider, does he, that the United States Employment Service, particularly as applicable to the farm labor placement, will be crippled by reducing the $9,460,000 to $1,460,000?

Mr. BALL. All the House allowed for the particular purpose was $1,460,000.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I understand the situation, the Senator is proposing to reduce, when the committee of the Senate has acted on the proposal, the $9,460,000, to $1,460,000, which takes care of the farm placement program. The remainder of it will go into conference, and that out of the conference, if the exigencies require it, there will come a sufficient amount, an adequate amount, as agreed upon by the conferees, for any increase in the grants to the States. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. BALL. That is correct. The Senator's amendment would restore the full budget estimate for the Farm Placement Service, but would take to conference the $8,000,000 additional for grants to States, which the House provided after the regular bill had passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me, I shall be compelled to leave the Senate in a moment and I should like to call his attention to the language of the conference report. This is on page 8 of the report of the committee under the item "Treasury Department, Bureau of Federal Supply, Salaries, and Expenses."

I shall read the language, if the Senator will permit:

The committee has not approved the request of the Treasury Department for $2,700,000 to enable the Bureau of Federal Supply to finance the first year of a 5-year interdepartmental project for a unified Federal Catalog System. The committee is of the opinion the project is a worthy one; however, there is no assurance that once the system is developed, it will be used by all Government agencies. The committee recommends that legislation be enacted providing for a unified Federal Catalog System and until such time as this is done, it is not felt that time and funds should be expended on such a project.

As a member of the committee, I understood that the language was inserted in the committee report merely to explain why the committee did not allow the budget estimate of $2,700,000 for this purpose. It appears that some of the departments and agencies of government are now carrying on cataloging with funds which they have available for that purpose, but that there has been a misunderstanding that the committee's report directed them to discontinue the cataloging. I think that understanding of the committee's language is erroneous, and I rose to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who is in charge of the bill, if I am not correct in stating that the language of the report merely gave a reason for not allowing the appropriation, but was not intended to interfere with any such activities as are being carried on within the agencies or departments by the use of other funds which have been made available.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Georgia is entirely correct. The committee in its report certainly did not intend to place any limitation on funds available in other items, but was referring merely to the budget estimate of $2,700,000 for a special project.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, there are two amendments on page 29 which we adopted early this morning, which should be reconsidered. They are a part of the same farm placement as was discussed a moment ago. I ask that the votes by which the committee amendment on page 29, line 6, and the committee amendment on the same page, line 9, were agreed to, be reconsidered, and that the committee amendments be rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made. The votes by which the amendments were agreed to will be reconsidered, and without objection, the amendments are rejected.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 33, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN UNITED NATIONS

The appropriation "United States participation in United Nations," contained in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1948, is hereby made available for the furnishing of living quarters for the use of the Representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations and this shall be accomplished by utilizing the authority contained in the second proviso of the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service," in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1948, with respect to the furnishing of living quarters for the use of the foreign service; and for making allotments to the United States Mission to the United Nations to defray the unusual expenses incident to the maintenance of an official residence for the United States Representative to the United Nations in the same manner that such allotments are authorized to Foreign Service Posts by Section 902 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, several Senators have called my attention to a paragraph amending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, beginning in line 16 on page 22, which sets a 60-day limit on appeals from regulations made by the Department of Commerce in liquidating that agency. Frankly, I do not understand just what the functions of the Department of Commerce are going to be. I have been told that changing "sixty days" in line 24 on page 22 to "120 days" will cure the situation, and I offer such an amendment, so that it may be sent to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4269) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BALL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROVISION FOR FUNDS FOR GREEK AND TURKISH AID

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words about an item in the appropriation bill which has just been passed. It refers to aid to Greece and Turkey.

I congratulate the committee upon adopting that provision. At this particular time in the history of the world, and in view of the posture of international affairs, it is of the utmost importance that the United States make good on the bill recommended by the President to extend economic and other aid to Turkey and to Greece.

Mr. President, as is well known, the United Nations appointed a Border Commission to visit the Greek border fronting on Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria. That Commission has reported, and from its report it is perfectly plain that irregular bands from Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria have been agitating and probably crossing the border into Greece, stirring up Greek elements wherever possible. That has brought about a very critical international situation. That area is a very sensitive spot.

We must be firm in the stand which we have taken under the leadership of the President to make it possible for Greece to resist aggression on her borders.

There are several kinds of aggression being practiced in Europe. One is the aggression of infiltration and pressure of an economic and political character; but this is aggression by force of arms. World War II was fought by the Allies in order to resist and put down aggression by warlike nations upon their peaceful neighbors. That is what is happening now on the northern border of Greece.

Without help from the United States, the Greeks would probably not be able to maintain the integrity of their territory or the independence of their Government, but it would be influenced by incursions from other nations—neighbors seeking to overthrow the Government of Greece and institute in lieu thereof a communistic state.

I assume that the action in the House of Representatives will be favorable. I wish to urge upon the Senate conferees, if the question should arise—which I do not anticipate—that they remain firm in the promises which we have made with reference to Greece and Turkey. We must stand firm. We must aid the Greeks in resisting incursions into their territory and maintaining the prestige and independence of the Greek Government.

In a lesser degree, the same reasoning applies to Turkey; but the most imminent situation is in Greece. It is disclosed by the report of the boundary commission that the difficulties there are imminent and critical.

A few days ago the United States proposed in the United Nations Security Council a semipermanent commission appointed to represent the Security Council and the United Nations along the Greek frontier, to observe from time to time the conditions existing there, and to advise and keep informed the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I am very greatly gratified that the bill carries funds for Greek and Turkish aid.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 794. An act to authorize the sale of a small tract of land on the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C.;

S. 892. An act for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session;

S. 1418. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States;

S. 1463. An act to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917;

S. 1480. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island;

S. 1494. An act to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387);

S. 1582. An act relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.; and

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1350) to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 859) to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 174. An act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "Ar act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588);

H. R. 3215. An act to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3394. An act 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; and

H. R. 3501. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2173) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ALLEN of California, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and Mr. DEANE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2659) to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ALLEN of California, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and Mr. DEANE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3045) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ALLEN of California, Mr. MCMAHON, and Mr. ABERNETHY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4140) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FERGUSON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, 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 amendments numbered 2, 17, 19, 24, 26, 29, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 11, 12, 16, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, and 31, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "one hundred and sixty-one"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That of said unexpended balance, not less than $12,000,000 is to be available for the construction of the Watauga and South Holston Dams"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 13 of said amendment strike out the figure "$4,714,397" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$4,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Tennessee Valley Authority: Not later than June 30, 1948, and not later than June 30 of each calendar year thereafter, until a total of $348,239,240 has been paid as herein provided, the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall pay from net income derived the immediately preceding

fiscal year from power operations (such net income to be determined by deducting power operating expenses, allocated common expense, and interest on funded debt from total power operating revenues) not less than $2,500,000 of its outstanding bonded indebtedness to the Treasury of the United States exclusive of interest, and such a portion of the remainder of such net income into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts as will, in the 10-year period ending June 30, 1958, and in each succeeding ten-year period until the aforesaid total of $348,239,240 shall have been paid, equal not less than a total of $37,059,810, including payment of bonded indebtedness exclusive of interest on such bonded indebtedness. Total payments of not less than $10,500,000 shall be made not later than June 30, 1948.

"Amounts equal to the total of all appropriations herein and hereafter made to the Tennessee Valley Authority for power facilities shall be paid by the board of directors thereof, in addition to the total of $348,239,240 specified in the foregoing paragraph, to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, such payments to be amortized over a period of not to exceed forty years after the year in which such facilities go into operation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That $175,000 shall be available only for the audit and revision of past accounting records"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of said amendment strike out the figure "$290,600" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 307. Section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Congress) is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 104. The Budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress for the fiscal year 1949 and each year thereafter shall be considered and legislation shall be enacted making necessary appropriations, as may be authorized by law, making available for expenditure for operating and administrative expenses such corporate funds or other financial resources or limiting the use thereof as the Congress may determine and providing for repayment of capital funds and the payment of dividends. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing Government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, nor as affecting the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended. The provisions of this section shall not be construed as affecting the existing authority of any Government corporation to make contracts or other commitments without reference to fiscal year limitations.' "

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 308. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Congress) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" 'This title shall apply to the same extent as to wholly owned Government corporations and for the same purposes to the following mixed ownership Government corporations: (1) The Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives, (2) Federal home loan banks, and (3) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, so long as these corporations have funds of or loans from the Government of the United States.' "

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9 and 21.

HOMER FERGUSON,
CLYDE M. REED,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
F. R. COUDERT, Jr.,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the conference report, because it carries within it what to me is a very offensive section. I refer to the portion of the bill which submits the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the control of the Bureau of the Budget, which in the final analysis is a political control.

Mr. President, I am not speaking in any sense critically regarding the conferees—and this particularly applies to my colleague [Mr. FERGUSON], who has presented the report. I know that the Senate conferees completely sympathize with the view which I am now expressing, and I know that they yielded in this particular instance only because they felt that they had no alternative under the circumstances. But I feel sure that the Senate conferees would be very happy to return to another conference if the Senate were to order it. I have the feeling that if the Senate were to adopt an eloquently affirmative position, as it did the other day in connection with amendments to some of the other bills, in this instance the House would yield to the Senate's point of view.

The general idea of bringing all Government corporations under full and intimate governmental control, including the control of the Bureau of the Budget, is a perfectly sound and advisable objective, and I have no quarrel in the world with it. Not only have I no quarrel with it, but I completely approve of it. But I respectfully submit that the Government corporations which are thus involved have no relationship to the character of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which is not a Government corporation in the same sense that is meant when other Government corporations are brought under control. I submit that it is fabulous nonsense to talk about the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in the light of the place that it holds in the basic economic system of the United States, in the same breath with other Government corporations, or to attempt to submit it to the regular Budget Bureau controls which it is here attempted to apply.

Mr. President, I ask Senators to remember back 15 years, to the days of the bank holidays. I ask them to remember the utter paralysis in America as the result of the bank holidays. I ask them to remember that those bank holidays did not flow so much from insolvent banks as from the general lack of confidence in American banks. The banks themselves, when they finally went through the wringer, in 9 cases out of 10 proved that they had been solvent. It was not their lack of solvency which ruined the country for a decade; it was the lack of public confidence in them, regardless of the nature and character of their assets.

It was under those circumstances that Congress created the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and from the moment it was created and from the moment it opened its doors there has never been a succeeding moment in the life of the Nation when there has been the slightest lack of public confidence in our banking system. As a result we went all through those perilous holidays when everything else was collapsing on all sides. We went all through them without a single bank failure in the land. If it had not been for the contribution which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation made to the life of the Nation at that time, I dread to think what the outcome might have been.

Mr. President, an institution of that sort has some degree of sacredness about it when it comes to tampering with it, by legislative indirection in an appropriation bill. As the bill came to the Senate from the House it contained a provision which subordinates the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the Bureau of the Budget. What does that mean? It means, in the techniques, that the budget of the FDIC must be annually submitted in advance to the Bureau of the Budget and approved by it. As a matter of elementary common sense, tell me how it would be possible to create a budget involving total contingencies. What is the budget of the FDIC for the next 12 months? It is a reflection of whatever the banking health of the Na-

tion is for the next 12 months. If there should be numerous bank failures over the land and the FDIC must staff itself to administer numerous failures and equip itself to take over vast areas of banking assets, that is one kind of a budget. If, on the contrary, the FDIC is to continue to succeed in maintaining banking solvency upon an even keel, we need a far lesser administrative structure and require none of the allocations of emergency funds. How in the world can the FDIC on January 1 provide itself with a budget to submit to the Bureau of the Budget until it knows whether the fiscal year is to be a healthy fiscal year in respect to the banking life of the Nation? If the FDIC is doubtful about the year to come and has to build up a large budget in anticipation of its doubts, I know of no surer way to precipitate a crisis in the United States than to have the budget of the FDIC necessarily increased in anticipation of bank failures made public to the world on New Year's each year.

I submit, Mr. President, that in the very nature of this tremendous public trust it is absolutely impossible to deal with it on any such budgetary basis as was proposed in the House bill, as was eliminated by the Senate, and as has been partially restored in the conference report.

Mr. President, that is not all. I remind the Senate that twice this year the legislative committee of the Senate which has jurisdiction over the FDIC has flatly refused to put it under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget, which, I repeat, is a political institution. Twice the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction over the FDIC, has refused to do the precise thing which is done by indirection in this conference report. If there was ever a demonstration of the vice of legislative riders, here it is.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from Michigan is so eminently correct that I want to add only that on the Democratic side of the Banking and Currency Committee on each occasion we have refused to put the FDIC under the Budget Bureau because it operates on the banks' money, and the Bureau of the Budget has nothing to do with it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. Of course, the Senator is entirely correct. That is the legislative record on the floor of the Senate, as the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] can testify. The Senator's committee has led on the floor of the Senate in denying directly the thing which is now sought to be done indirectly.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee reported favorably a bill which was passed by both Houses. I think the Senator from Indiana was the author of the bill. That bill denied anyone the right to place the FDIC under the Budget Bureau. I agree 100 percent with the able Senator from Michigan that it should not be permitted to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Was not this whole matter considered by the committees and by both Houses of Congress when the Congress passed the Government Corporation Control Act, and at that time this very action which the Appropriations Committee now seeks was denied? Is not that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Alabama is entirely correct. Whenever it has been tested there has been but one answer.

This is the first time there has ever been the shadow of success for what I assert is an assault upon the independence of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which, in turn, is a fundamental assault upon the basis of American confidence in American banking. I do not understand why it creeps into this bill, particularly in view of the fact that the Budget Bureau does not want this control, that the Treasury Department does not want it and recommends against it; in view of the fact that the FDIC warningly urges that this is a most seriously dangerous thing to do; in view of the fact that all American banking interests are opposed; in view of the fact that all legislative committees of the Congress are opposed, and certainly in view of the fact that the depositors—90,000,000 of them—who sleep nights because they can depend upon the FDIC, do not want the first step taken in the direction of breaking down the independence of this institution.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to refer to the remarks of the Senator from Indiana. If I am not correct I hope he will correct me. The Banking and Currency Committee, to which this matter was referred, under the able Senator from Indiana, voted unanimously not to make such a change, did it not?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to remind the Senate of one thing——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the FDIC is similar to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. And also similar to the office of the Comptroller of the Currency. Neither of those agencies is under the Budget Bureau. No one so far as I know has ever thought seriously of suggesting that they be placed under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget. The FDIC does not operate on funds from the Treasury; it operates on assessments made on the bank, just as the Federal Reserve System operates and just as the office of the Comptroller of the Currency operates. Is not that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is entirely correct. The FDIC is on all fours with the Federal Reserve System with respect to the fiscal structure of the American economy. No one has yet had the temerity to propose that the Federal Reserve System should be robbed of its independence and subordinated to a political bureau of the Government. Yet, here is an institution which is even more sensitive with respect to the necessities for its independence, and we confront a conference report which for the first time proposes to make it possible for political controls to determine what happens.

I am not so much afraid of what the political controls would do, because I assume that they would have an adequate respect for this institution. But I am saying that the fundamental importance and value of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is psychological; it is the faith that for 15 years America has demonstrated it has in this institution. At the moment when the FDIC is about completing $1,000,000,000 of earnings of its own, so that it can eliminate all Government capital, at this time when there is a billion dollars of money available in the Treasury of the FDIC, if the American people read that, at long last, in Washington something is going on which indicates that the political powers are restless and will remain restless until they can get their hands upon this great institution, the effect will be most deplorable.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Were sections 307 and 308 of the bill restored in the conference?

Mr. VANDENBERG. They were.

Mr. AIKEN. They are the sections which tear down——

Mr. VANDENBERG. They tear down the Farm Credit Organization; that is correct.

Mr. President, there is a great deal to be said for the objection which is to be made against an equivalent raid on the independence of the farm cooperative institutions.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, these sections tear down some of the most useful agencies of government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct. I shall leave the further discussion of that matter to those who are more familiar with it. I am confining myself to this fundamental conception, because I submit, Mr. President, that the one thing in the economic life of the United States which is basically essential is the maintenance of banking confidence, which is dependent, fundamentally and primarily, upon the continuing independent sanctity of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry that I have not been able to be in the Chamber during all the discussion, and I have missed some of the debate. But the

amendment the Senator is arguing has to do with the section which was added to the bill in the House of Representatives, and was stricken out by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The reason given at the time was that it was legislation on an appropriation bill, and that the matter should be studied by the proper legislative committee, rather than by the appropriations committee.

As a matter of fact, we had this matter before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and we discussed rather at length this very idea of making the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation subject to the Budget Control Act. That committee decided that it was not proper to do so. I believe the committee was unanimous in reaching that decision.

Some members of the committee felt that the administrative expense should be subject to budget control; and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Harl, chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, told us that already there was submitted to the budget the administrative expenses for each year.

Based upon that, the regularly constituted legislative committee of the Senate rejected the idea of placing the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under the control of the Budget Control Act. In other words, we did exactly what the Senate Appropriations Committee said should be done: We studied it. After studying it, we rejected it. I think it is an unsound principle to be written into a bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. He has reviewed a situation which, in some respects, already has been submitted by other Senators.

Now let me conclude, Mr. President, because I do not think it is necessary to labor this point. I wish to remind the Senate that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has no place in the same category or bracket with the other Government corporations to which this bill is fundamentally dedicated. I remind the Senate that the FDIC does not get one penny, not one nickel, of tax money; and it never has. It is entirely dependent upon its own premiums. In the operation of its premium account, it has finally accumulated $1,000,000,000 of assets, so that in the next 2 years there will not even be a nickel of Government funds in its capital structure.

Here is an institution which has bailed itself out from zero, in respect to its own finances, and today is the finest example of fiscal ability and success, even as a corporation, that can be found in this Nation. Here is an institution which in 15 years has resulted in a banking record in the United States without the loss of one penny to one bank depositor in the United States. That has happened in a decade and a half. Here is an institution which is totally successful by every possible degree or manner of measurement which can be applied to it. Here is an institution which the Bureau of the Budget does not want to tamper with, which the Treasury does not wish to have anyone tamper with, which the banking fraternity in the United States wishes to remain independent, which the legislative committees of the Senate have twice insisted must remain independent.

Here is an institution which does not deserve the proposed treatment at this eleventh hour in the Eightieth Congress—and I say it with great feeling, Mr. President—particularly under the auspices of the Republican Party, which is supposed to have some particular dedication to the preservation of private enterprise, and some particular aversion to the needless application of governmental controls. So I submit that under all these combined circumstances, it is not only a travesty, but it is a crime, if this conference report is adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that the Senate agree to the conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have requested the Senator to yield to me, and he very kindly has done so, because I should like to take some time on the matter which has been discussed just now by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I wish to say that I agree with him 100 percent. I wish to make the point that the same argument applies with reference to the Home Loan Bank System.

I should like to go into that matter in detail. However, I am called to a meeting on the second supplemental appropriation bill, and I cannot remain in the Chamber to discuss this matter. I hope, however, that in the discussion which will follow, the principles which have been announced by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] as applying to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, will be shown to apply with equal force to the Home Loan Bank System, which has no place under the present corporations act.

I should like to discuss it at length. I cannot at this time.

I thank the junior Senator from Michigan for giving me the opportunity to make these few remarks.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk a conference report and ask permission that it be considered. It is the conference report on the continuation of the consumers' credit activity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I object, and my reason for objecting is that we now have before us, an important conference report which should be disposed of. I think the conference report we are considering will be rejected and will have to go back to conference. Therefore, Mr. President, the constant interruptions being made are unnecessary and unwise. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is raised.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish to make just a brief statement with reference to the report. I wish to say that I should like to associate myself with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] in their remarks in opposition to the conference report bill. I communicated with the banking commissioner in my own State, and he is heartily opposed to the bill, as I believe most of those concerned in my State are. I hope the conference report will not be agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I realized when I submitted this conference report what I was bringing back to the Senate. I realized that there was great and serious objection to it, indeed, enthusiastic objection. But at times one in a conference faces a situation, as we have in the last few days, which makes him feel that he is compelled to return to the Senate for further instructions, as it were, in order that he may try again.

In this particular case it was impossible even to do business with the House conferees without first considering the two sections now being discussed. The Committee on Appropriations eliminated them. We knew they were legislation, and would have been subject to a point of order if they had originated in the Senate, but they originated in the House, where the rules were suspended so they could be adopted. The conferees came into conference adamant in their position to keep the sections in the bill.

We made some headway, I feel, when we struck out the word "use" on page 31, and I think I should explain that. The language is "for use such corporate funds or other financial resources." The word "use" was stricken out, and inserted was the language "expenditure for operating and administrative expenses." We were trying to limit the bill at least to the operating and administrative expenditures so that it would not cover losses of insurance or other than operating expenses.

Mr. President, at the end of section 308 we were able to insert this language:

So long as these corporations have funds of or loans from the Government of the United States.

That meant that when a corporation was able to buy out, these sections would not apply.

Then, Mr. President, the words "for the calendar year 1949 and each year thereafter" were inserted, because we felt that if we had to accept the Government corporations appropriation bill with these two sections in it we would at least have a show of getting legislation from the proper legislative committee on the subject.

Mr. President, what I am saying may sound like an apology for bringing back such a report, but I think every member on the conference committee felt we had done the best we could. We were in a bad situation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator certainly owes no one any apology for the report he brings back in connection with the Government corporations appropriation bill. What he has just said is entirely true. He and his coconferees

on the part of the Senate made substantial and valuable headway in the direction of at least partially protecting the FDIC, if they confronted the situation in which they could not protect it completely. I congratulate the Senator and his fellow conferees on the work they did. I am sure the Senator equally agrees that if he could have a unanimous vote of the Senate behind him in one more conference in an effort to do a still better job he would be as happy as I would be over that result.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, even without a unanimous vote the junior Senator from Michigan is willing to abide by the decision of the Senate, and return to the conference, and I know that every member of the conference committee will do everything he can to carry out the wishes of the Senate, and to return with a bill, if possible.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As one of the members of the conference committee, I wish to say, with all the force that is within me, that I agree totally with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan. The Senator well knows that when I signed this conference report I did it reluctantly, with the understanding that I could make what observations I cared to make on the floor of the Senate to see if possible if the FDIC could not be taken out from under title I and put back only as a Corporation to be audited, rather than to be further controlled under title I of the act.

I think it unnecessary to develop any more arguments. I believe I understand how the junior Senator from Michigan feels about the matter. I am satisfied that if the Senate wants to go along and vote the conference report down, as has been suggested by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, the Senate conferees will be fortified in the position they can take in a further conference with the conferees on the part of the House. Personally I think the report should be voted down, and I am perfectly willing to make the fight if the Senate wants that done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I rise to support, very briefly, what the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has said. He was the chairman of the Senate conferees, and I was one of the members of the conference. I attended four and a part of the fifth session with him.

The House conferees came in with a determination to discuss no items in the bill at all until the language in sections 307 and 308 was straightened out to their satisfaction. After the second meeting the conference broke up, and we did not return and renew our conference for several days. We then went back, and the House conferees had the same determination, and it was then that we drafted the language, which, as the senior Senator from Michigan has said, substantially improves the two sections.

I feel the same as do the senior Senator from Michigan and the junior Senator from Michigan. We do not want these sections.

But we are up against the fact of supporting the TVA and various other governmental agencies, and it was for that reason we finally made the effort to draft this language, to put off the effect of the provision for one full year, in order to permit legislation next year, if desirable, and then we proceeded to work out figures in the other sections. If the Senate feels, as it apparently does, as evidenced by speeches of its members, that different action should be taken, I am certain that the junior Senator from Michigan and the other conferees will try to follow out their judgment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I want to say that besides striking out the FDIC sections 307 and 308, which were restored in conference it would strike crippling blows at almost all the farm credit organizations, making it very difficult if not impossible for some of them to do business. It puts them in a position of having to go to the Bureau of the Budget before the beginning of each year and to estimate the amount of the loans which they will make during the year, regardless of what the weather may be, or what unforeseen conditions may arise. I had intended to speak at some length on this, but judging from appearances, the temper of the Senate is such that it intends to send the bill back to conference in no uncertain manner, and express its wholehearted opposition to these sections. Therefore I shall content myself with what I have said, and not speak at any greater length.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as stated before by members of the conference committee, we did not have the opportunity to have a vote in the Senate upon these two sections, because they were stricken out by the Appropriations Committee. We now have the opportunity to vote upon this matter, and I hope the Senate will have a yea-and-nay vote. I hope that there may be a quorum call before the vote, and that the vote will disclose to the House exactly how the Senate feels about the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this question is of such importance to my constituents in Illinois that I desire to read into the RECORD at this point a telegram I received from Harry C. Hausman, secretary of the Illinois Bankers' Association. The association is greatly concerned, along with other banking organizations throughout the country, over the provision of House bill 3756, which is now being considered:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 22, 1947.*

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senate:

This association is gravely concerned, along with the other banking organizations throughout the country, over a provision in H. R. 3756 now being considered in conference committee. Section 308 of this bill calls for inclusion of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under the control of Bureau of the Budget. FDIC is supported by the assessments paid by 14,000 insured banks. These banks have nothing but praise of the achievements of FDIC and the careful and efficient manner of its management, both of which stem from its independence and flexibility of action. The problems of FDIC are those of a private insurance corporation. These banks have in the past and will in the future pay the cost of maintaining this corporation as the steel beam under American confidence in the banks of this country and these banks are opposed to any legislation that will tend to destroy the confidence of their 90,000,000 depositors. By including FDIC in section 308, the operations of the corporation are gravely hampered and the lawmakers would thereby plant doubts in the minds of these depositors. The net effect of inclusion of FDIC would be to deprive it of a permanent insurance fund, paid for by the banks, and subject it to the vagaries of appropriation bills. No more unfortunate news could be received by the country than news that Congress has determined at this time when the insurance fund has reached over $1,000,000,000 to encroach upon the independence of FDIC. Since FDIC is supported exclusively by bank assessments, banks and depositing public have the right to insist that it must be kept independent in fact as well as name. Section 308 does not have effect of but does actually destroy independence of FDIC. This association urges every possible effort to remove FDIC from section 308. May we count on your support?

HARRY C. HAUSMAN,
Secretary, Illinois Bankers Association.

Mr. President, I subscribe to the thoughts that are expressed in that telegram. From the beginning of the FDIC until now, this is the first time that either branch of Congress, or the Congress itself, has attempted in any way to interfere with the orderly arrangement and working of that important institution. I hope the Senate will follow the lead of the Senator from Michigan, and that the conference report will be recommitted to the conferees.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a somewhat lengthy telegram received from the Iowa Bankers Association, of the State of Iowa, in support of the position of the senior Senator from Michigan on this issue.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *July 22, 1947.*

Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully urge you in your important position to do everything you can to eliminate permanently section 308 of H. R. 3756 which section would put the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under the Federal Budget. That corporation being one supported by the member banks of the Nation is of no financial cost whatever to the taxpayers. It has been and continues to be inimitably managed in the interests of bank depositors. The corporation should not be handicapped nor shackled in its efforts to give the Nation's bank depositors and particularly the small depositor the greatest possible protection. We once tried out here in Iowa putting our State banking department under our State legislative budget. It just wouldn't work; it bid fair to completely wreck the efficiency of the

department's administration by the State superintendent of banking here in Iowa. The Iowa General Assembly quickly followed the requests of our State banking department and our State association and the information and data they submitted on the experiences of a banking department trying to operate under the uncertainties of getting sufficient appropriations to protect bank depositors as they have a right to expect and which the banking industry want to give and without cost to the Iowa taxpayers, and therefore the Iowa Legislature discontinued that budgetary requirement years ago. If it would not work in Iowa, certainly there are grounds to believe that the budgetary idea for the FDIC will also find great difficulty in operating in a national way. Let us not even experiment with it in a national way. It can be a costly experiment for depositors whose interests should by all means come first and remain paramount. Thanks for your contemplated help and that of Senator WILSON to whom a like wire goes.

Kindest regards.

IOWA BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
R. H. MILLER, *Chairman.*
FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
W. H. BRENTON, *President.*
FRANK WARNER, *Secretary.*

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it has been my intention to have something to say in opposition to the provision in reference to the FDIC. In view of the very strong arguments made against the provision by the very distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, and the very practical statement made by the Senate conferees, the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, I shall not delay the Senate. I think I know the temper of the Senate. I believe the Senate will overwhelmingly vote down the conference report. I wish, however, to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD five editorials from leading publications in this country, such as the American Banker, of New York City, the Chicago Journal of Commerce, the Philadelphia Inquirer, and so forth.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Banker, New York City, July 9, 1947]

KEEP FDIC INDEPENDENT, URGES PENNSYLVANIA BANK LEADER

WILLIAMSPORT, PA.—Warning that bank deposit insurance and bank supervision could readily become politically dominated was voiced by George Shotwell, president of the Pennsylvania Bankers Association, and president of the Williamsport National Bank, commenting on a rider on House bill 3756, which would place the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under control of the Bureau of the Budget.

"Shifting of the FDIC from status of an independent corporation, able to move quickly and efficiently, to that of a politically controlled agency, constitutes a warning of which the bankers of this country should take immediate cognizance," he said, "since the force and effect of such a step could easily lead to an involvement of the Federal Reserve System and the office of the Comptroller of the Currency. All three agencies are supported wholly by bank assessments, fees paid by the banks for examinations and similar collections, receiving nothing from the Treasury and asking nothing from it.

"It is a well-established fact," he added, "that the operation of the FDIC has been highly successful. It has grown to be a billion-dollar corporation which now intends to retire the advance originally made to it by the United States Treasury and Federal Reserve System, of approximately $289,000,000. We should exert every effort to preserve the individual status of agencies so vitally involved in the operation of our independent banking system."

[From the Chicago Journal of Commerce of July 7, 1947]

UNDERMINING THE FDIC

Some 14 years ago the public stopped depositing its money in mattresses and resumed the use of banks for that purpose. Almost single-handed the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has been responsible for restoring confidence in our banking system.

Congress is now acting upon a bill—H. R. 3756—which would seriously undermine that confidence. Section 308 of the measure, already passed by the House and now in committee before the Senate, would treat the FDIC as a wholly owned Government corporation.

By transferring the FDIC from title II to title I of the Government Corporation Control Act Congress would oblige the agency to submit an annual budget program for the following fiscal year, with estimates of operations, administrative expenses, and borrowings. By thus gravely hampering its flexibility of operations, our lawmakers would plant doubts in the minds of the holders of 90,000,000 deposit accounts—doubt that the FDIC could continue effectively to carry out the Federa deposit-insurance law.

No longer possessing a permanent insurance fund, the FDIC would find itself subjected to the vagaries of appropriation bills. Such a change would hardly create peace of mind on the part of depositors.

The FDIC is not supported, for the most part, by public funds. Of present resources of some $1,100,000,000, the banks have paid in $700,000,000 in assessments. Months ago the FDIC offered to return to the Government its original stake.

The FDIC is under constant scrutiny. Yearly it reports to Congress and to the Comptroller General, who audits the financial transactions of the Corporation. Its 14,000 insured banks also keep watch with Argus eyes. The FDIC has been run efficiently and without "venturing into unwarranted fields." The Comptroller General has described its accounting system as "well conceived, and its accounts are well supervised and kept."

As Chairman Maple T. Harl, of the FDIC, pertinently observes, "neither the comptroller of the currency nor the Federal Reserve System, both of whom operate with funds similar to ours * * * are budgeted or audited. It seems to me the same reasons should apply to the FDIC."

If Congress is avid to correct abuses and bad management, it has a broad field for action within the Government itself without hounding a semiprivate corporation which has done a first-class job since its inception.

[From the American Banker, New York City, July 3, 1947]

CONNECTICUT BANKS HIT BUDGET BUREAU CONTROL OVER FDIC

MANCHESTER, VT.—Richard Rapport, Connecticut commissioner of banking, appealed to bankers of the State to take an active part in the opposition of bankers elsewhere, and Federal and State bank supervisory authorities, to the inclusion of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under the United States Budget Bureau control, as proposed in a measure placed before congressional committees in June.

Following Mr. Rapport's statement, the convention of the Connecticut Bankers Association here directed that the following resolution be sent to Connecticut Representatives in Congress and to the State's Senators:

"Resolved, That it is vital to the preservation of the banking system of our country and particularly vital to the protection of depositors that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation be continued as a completely independent agency, free from any possible political pressure or political involvement; that the inclusion of the FDIC in section 308 of H. R. 3756 is an example of recurring attempts to destroy that independence, and, therefore, that the FDIC should not be included in section 308 of H. R. 3756."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 8, 1947]

KEEP HANDS OFF FDIC

Howard A. Loeb, chairman of the Tradesmens National Bank & Trust Co. of this city, calls timely attention to a dangerous measure, already approved by the House and now pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee, to bring the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under political control.

This is a proposal tied into the Government corporations appropriations bill to place FDIC under the Bureau of the Budget.

As Mr. Loeb points out, this might result, during times of stress, in limiting the aid the Corporation could give to endangered banks, or in delaying it, which would be equally perilous. FDIC funds are contributed by the banks to protect deposits.

The system, as an independent agency, has worked remarkably well. It has not been extravagantly conducted. It should be let alone. The provisions in this bill affecting its independence and, possibly, its safety, should be eliminated.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 7, 1947]

MOVE FOR POLITICAL CONTROL OF FDIC HIT

Not only would the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation lose its independent status but its effectiveness would be seriously endangered if the House-approved Government Corporations Appropriations Act, 1948, now pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee, is enacted into law, Howard A. Loeb, chairman of Tradesmens National Bank & Trust Co., warned yesterday.

Loeb said that by placing the FDIC under the control of the Bureau of the Budget, with its appropriation fixed months in advance, the FDIC, in the event of unforeseen or unpredictable economic developments, might find itself unable to come to the assistance of banks requiring aid due to lack of funds to pay the cost of maintaining a staff to handle substandard assets taken over.

He said that FDIC administrative expenses are wholly proportionate to conditions prevailing in the banking world.

"The FDIC," Loeb said, "has done a very constructive piece of work, without fear or favor, and one devoted entirely to the best interests of depositors. Through its supervision of banking it has aided in strengthening the banking system and it would be extremely detrimental, particularly at this time, to end its independent status and place it under political control."

POLITICAL CONTROL SOUGHT

He also warned that if the FDIC is made subject to the Government Corporations Appropriations Act and its budget were under the control of the Budget Bureau, thus denying the right of the Corporation to use its own funds arising out of premiums paid by the banks and income on investments; it may foreshadow similar action with regard to the Federal Reserve System and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

"From all indications," Loeb said, "this proposed legislation may be the first step of a move to bring all three bank supervisory agencies under political controls. All three are supported wholly by the banks. The salaries of the Comptroller of the Currency and those of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are paid by the banks out of current income.

LOSS OF INDEPENDENCE

"If this measure is enacted, it will not only mean the loss of the FDIC's independence, but it will also mean the possible use of bank-paid assessments, that in the past were a reserve against loss by bank depositors, to aid other Government programs."

Loeb added that attempts to pass similar legislation in the past had been halted before they reached advanced stages. In the present instance, the House Banking Committee, "where it could have been given careful consideration and its dangers and possible results properly appraised," was bypassed and the measure passed through the House Appropriations Committee instead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. VANDENBERG and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Moore
Baldwin	Hawkes	Morse
Ball	Hayden	Murray
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Hill	O'Conor
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Ives	Reed
Bushfield	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ecton	McGrath	Umstead
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McMahon	Watkins
Flanders	Magnuson	Wherry
Fulbright	Malone	White
George	Martin	Wiley
Green	Maybank	Williams
Gurney	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before a vote is taken on sending the bill back to conference, I want to say that in sections 307 and 308 of the bill there is the most brazen attempt to destroy farm credit in America I have ever seen since I have been in the Congress. The credit agencies which would be crippled by adoption of these sections are the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the Production Credit Corporations, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, and the banks for cooperatives, and section 307 would also apply to the Commodity Credit Corporation, making it difficult, if not impossible, for those agencies to continue the work which they have done so well during the last few years. I hope the Senate will express its sentiments by voting unanimously to send the bill back to conference. So far as I am concerned, I never will accept any conference report on this bill which carries those sections, which are deliberately designed to cripple the farm lending agencies of America.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what the Senator from Vermont has said. I desire to place the greatest emphasis I can on what he said respecting the Farm Credit Administration. We must not impair, hamper, or cripple the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Can the Senator from Vermont tell us what is the genus of these efforts in the bill to cripple the farm agencies, including the Commodity Credit Corporation and the lending agencies to which he has referred?

Mr. AIKEN. It would be very difficult to be sure whether it comes from overgrasping Federal agencies and their officials, or from a certain group of overgrasping bankers who would do everything within their power to destroy farm credit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to agree to the conference report on House bill 3756. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Oregon correct in understanding that if a Senator wishes to approve the conference report he will vote "yea," and if he wishes to send it back for further conference he will vote "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote to reject is a "nay" vote.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED. I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am informed that if he were present and voting, he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent. These Senators, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are unavoidably detained. If present and voting, they would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who is absent because of illness, would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is necessarily absent, would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], who are detained on official business, would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], who is necessarily absent, would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, and who has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 1, nays 83, as follows:

YEAS—1

Russell

NAYS—83

Aiken	Hatch	Moore
Baldwin	Hawkes	Morse
Ball	Hayden	Murray
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Hill	O'Conor
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Ives	Reed
Bushfield	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capper	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Dworshak	McClellan	Tydings
Eastland	McFarland	Umstead
Ecton	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ellender	McKellar	Watkins
Ferguson	McMahon	Wherry
Flanders	Magnuson	White
Fulbright	Malone	Wiley
George	Martin	Williams
Green	Maybank	Young
Gurney	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—11

Bridges	O'Daniel	Tobey
Capehart	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Downey	Robertson, Wyo	Wilson
McCarran	Taylor	

So the conference report was rejected.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments still in disagreement and request a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the same conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. REED, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. WHERRY conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3756, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 24, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert: "*Provided further*, That there shall be transferred to this account not to exceed $765,000 of the funds available under sections 303 and 502 of Public Law 849, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended; such total funds to be available for all necessary administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator."

Mr. FERGUSON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment No. 9.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4326. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding a new proviso to section 1;

H. R. 72. An act to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 673. An act to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels;

H. R. 1239. An act to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 1341. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.;

H. R. 1565. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions";

H. R. 1566. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and seal, Seat of Government, and the States";

H. R. 1567. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds";

H. R. 1633. An act to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia";

H. R. 1714. An act to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2054. An act to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service;

H. R. 2083. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 2084. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitrations";

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 3022. An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States;

H. R. 3043. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3131. An act to extend for 3 months the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3541. An act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3619. An act relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.;

H. R. 3818. An act to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4084. An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING FOR VETERANS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 610, House bill 2181, relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans, with the understanding that debate on the bill shall be limited to 20 minutes, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not want to object—for I wish to help expedite the business of the Senate, if possible, there is on the calendar Order No. 602, House bill 3342, which not only I want very much to see considered, but I think the whole country is desirous of having a vote on that bill. May I ask the Senator from Ohio if he would be willing to indicate whether or not we might take up that bill, limit debate, and have a vote on it?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is not my intention to make any such motion, if that is what the Senator wishes to know.

Mr. HATCH. I ask the Senator from Ohio if he would indicate a slight willingness to proceed along the line I have just suggested.

Mr. TAFT. I think it would be deceptive to indicate any such slight willingness.

Mr. HATCH. Then I judge from what the Senator from Ohio has said, namely, that it would be deceptive for him to indicate such a willingness, that he is unalterably opposed to taking up the bill and having a vote on it.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that so far as the Voice of America program is concerned, the proposal came before us and was fully considered in the Appropriations Committee. Hearings were held on the entire question. In spite of the lack of legislative authority, I withdrew my objection and let the appropriation go through. It was my understanding, at least, that that settled the matter for this year, and that we would take the rest of this year to consider the question of authority. For that reason I feel very strongly that we should not consider this matter until we have full opportunity to debate it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I do not care to yield further.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor. I apologize to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio does have the floor. The Chair advises the Senator from New Mexico that the Senator from Ohio obtained the floor when the Senator from New Mexico concluded.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Mexico had not concluded. The Senator from New Mexico yielded to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair apologizes, but he had no way of knowing.

Mr. HATCH. I did not yield the floor. Such was not my intention; and I object to being forcibly taken from the floor in that manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair regrets that he recognized the Senator from Ohio when the Senator from New Mexico concluded. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to address a remark or two to my good friend from New Mexico. I think I thoroughly understand his position on this matter. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield the floor. I have no desire to retain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico now desire the floor?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. My protest was voiced only against the procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair duly apologizes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I accept, I am sure, as graciously as the Chair offers his apology. There is nothing personal involved.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. No; I shall not yield now. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Is a motion in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion is not in order, because there is a pending motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to take up the so-called Kem resolution.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN RELATIONS BY INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE, ETC.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside and that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 602, House bill 3342.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HATCH. I do not yield.

Mr. TAFT. I thought the Senator from New Mexico had finished.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Mexico has not finished.

House bill 3342 is to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills

between the people of the United States and other countries.

In connection with the unanimous-consent request which I have made I desire to make a few remarks. I do not care to yield the floor; I do not care to yield at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a point of order?

Mr. HATCH. I certainly have a right to be recognized on the pending matter. I have a right to retain the floor. I think I shall yield to my friend from Massachusetts. I wonder what his point of order is. No; I do not yield at all.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield.

Mr. President, I am afraid to yield even for a question, for fear I shall lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico will please proceed.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Mexico will proceed in his own time, in his own right, and according to his own desires.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield so that the Senator from Missouri may state his point of order?

Mr. HATCH. I do not.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has just suggested to me that my unanimous-consent request is not in proper form, in that I failed to ask that the pending business be laid aside temporarily. I now amend my unanimous-consent request to include the word "temporarily"—that the pending business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed to a vote on House bill 3342. On that subject I desire to speak for a little while.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask whether a unanimous-consent request is debatable if it is objected to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request has not been objected to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not yield for any purpose except for a question. I have a right to discuss my unanimous-consent request. I am claiming the floor, and I expect to continue.

Did the Senator from Nebraska desire to ask me a question?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I shall take up this bill, title by title, and section by section, not only so that the Senators may know, but that the country may know what is going on in the Senate of the United States. I want the country to know, Mr. President, that the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the United States are so anxious, so eager to go home that they will not permit a Senator to discuss or debate this question. As I said yesterday, I am not asking a single soul to vote for this bill. If the Senate wants to vote against it, that is all right; but I shall demand that the Senate express itself, that it go on record, that it give the privilege to individual Senators to vote either yes or no. If I can have that assurance, Mr. President, if the leadership on the other side will say, "Certainly, we will call up this bill. We will limit debate; we do not want to debate any length of time, possible 15 or 20 or 30 minutes, but we will have a vote on it," I will surrender the floor.

Again, Mr. President, I beg a poor boon from the Senate of the United States. I ask only a chance to vote; that is all. Has the time come in this country, a country of free, democratic institutions, when Senators will not even accord the privilege of a vote? Mr. President, it is a pretty sorry record that is being written this day in the Senate of the United States. I do not care how good a bill may be or how bad it may be, Senators should have the right to vote on it. As I said yesterday, here is a bill which was considered by the House committee for many days, which was debated at length on the floor of the House, and passed by that body by a 3-to-1 vote and which was also considered fully by the Senate committee; and yet the Senate will not even allow a vote on it.

Again I say, Mr. President, we are writing in the book of history a sorry and a sordid page which will rise up and confront free people everywhere. This is a Republican bill, Mr. President. I am a Democrat, and I am begging the Republicans to vote for their own bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. Yes; for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from New Mexico agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that when it comes to applying the principle he has laid down, namely, that we ought to have a vote on any bill, good or bad, it applies also to the so-called Kem resolution?

Mr. HATCH. Yes. I said that this morning. I offered to yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. I told the Senator from Missouri that I would vote for his resolution. I am not inconsistent. I am taking the position for which I have stood all my life, and I hope the time will never come when I recede from that position, that freemen ought to have the right to speak freely, and ought to have the right in the Senate of the United States to vote freely. May I ask those on the majority side if they will be willing to accord to us who believe in this bill this small consideration?

Mr. TAFT. Did the Senator ask me a question?

Mr. HATCH. No. Does the Senator want to ask me a question?

Mr. TAFT. I thought the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. HATCH. No; I cannot yield. I should like to, and I want to be courteous——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska may ask me a question and that I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he will permit us to vote first on the Kem resolution?

Mr. HATCH. So far as I am concerned, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. If that can be accomplished, the situation might be worked out.

Mr. HATCH. So far as I am concerned, my answer is "Yes," and I have no hesitancy about it. Is the Senator proposing something? We might get somewhere. I am not sure, however, because I have not the time and I am not in charge. When I see hesitancy on the other side of the aisle and see other Senators talking to the Senator from Nebraska and patting him on the shoulder, perhaps he went wrong in making his suggestion. But I say to the Senator from Nebraska that if we vote on the Kem resolution, which is a resolution to discharge a committee, the question would still be present, and that would not be quite fair. I want to be perfectly honest and perfectly fair with the Senator from Nebraska. Frankly, I would be glad to trade a poor, insignificant resolution relating to politics and nothing else for a resolution which may affect the peace of the world.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield.

Mr. President, as I was saying, if that is the sort of trading that has to go on in the Senate of the United States, I shall meet it, and I shall meet it before the people, too.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield to anyone for any purpose.

Mr. President, the hour is almost 4 o'clock in the afternoon. I tell the Senate that we shall be here quite a while. We might even have another all night session, and make ourselves as ridiculous as we made ourselves last night, which is exactly what the Senate did. The Republicans have charged the Democrats with filibustering, but the Republicans took all night long last night, in filibustering against their own measure. Mr. President, let us talk turkey. Those are the facts.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield to anyone for any purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri; I should like to engage in colloquy, with questions back and forth; but I am afraid that someone would make a point of order and I would be taken off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from New

Mexico that under the ruling which the present occupant of the chair made last night, the Senator from New Mexico would have a perfect right to yield for a question, without in any way jeopardizing his position on the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator who happens to be occupying the chair at this time that I appreciate full well his frankness, his wisdom, and his desire to rule wisely and justly at all times on matters of parliamentary procedure, and the position which I now take is no reflection whatever upon the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from New Mexico would receive a fair ruling from the present occupant of the chair; but the Senator from New Mexico has noticed some rather strange proceedings around here during the last day or two; and because on yesterday, when the Senator from New Mexico rose to pay a compliment to the Senator from New Jersey——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield.

Mr. President, as I was saying, because on yesterday when I rose to pay a compliment to the Senator from New Jersey, a point of order was made against me, I must decline to yield, in order to make sure that I protect my position on the floor.

Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. And I intend to occupy the floor, and I intend to occupy it for some time. That is not a threat. I know that a filibuster cannot be conducted to force the passage of legislation. If it could be, if that were possible, if I had the physical and mental strength, I would stand on this floor from now until doomsday, if necessary, to force a vote on the bill to which I have referred. However, I cannot force a vote. All I can do is stand here and demand that the Senate of the United States have the courage to go on record regarding the bill. I do not wish to argue the bill. I do not wish to debate it for a minute. I would be happy if the Republican leadership would take the words of their own author of this bill, the honorable and distinguished Representative MUNDT, of South Dakota, who made as fine a presentation before our committee as ever was made before it, and I should like to have the Senators on the other side of this aisle take Mr. MUNDT'S words and be guided by them, not by my words. If they are not satisfied with that—and I shall read his words directly—I should like to have them take the words of Representative LODGE, the brother of our own colleague in this body. Mr. President, I defy any Member on the other side of the aisle to take the words of Representative LODGE and vote against this bill. This is a Republican bill that I am talking about, and I, a Democrat, am asking and pleading with and begging the Republicans to pass their own bill. What a situation this is!

Mr. President, do you know what it is all about? I shall tell you. It is about a desire to adjourn, to quit their business, to quit the work for which they were elected by their constituents, to lay down on their jobs and quit, and go home on Saturday night.

Mr. President, what is so important about July 26? Why should the Senate quit at that time? Senators on the other side of the aisle are going to boast about the accomplishments of this Congress. They are going out to the people of the country, and they will tell them what wonderful things they have done. Mr. President, a great deal has been said by Senators on the other side of the aisle about the New Deal. I shall be perfectly willing to meet any Senator who sits on the other side of the aisle and go on the platforms of this country and debate the New Deal against the Old Deal—the Old Deal which found the farmers bankrupt and impoverished, the Old Deal which saw the banks closed, and long lines of depositors trying to get their money back.

I should like to talk about the New Deal and the Old Deal, Mr. President, if that is what is desired. I should like to talk about the hundreds and the thousands of persons who were unemployed all over the country, from the East to the West, and the North to the South. I should like to talk about how hungry they were, how hopeless they were.

Mr. President, I do not wish to get into a political discussion. The bill we are discussing is not political. I am wandering; I confess I am wandering, and whatever comes into my mind I talk about, as other Senators do when they take the floor under circumstances like the present. I would not arouse the antagonism of my Republican friends. I realize that they have the majority in this body. Voting solidly, they can kill any legislative proposal or they can pass any. I do not want to raise political considerations.

I said yesterday, Mr. President, that I served as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. There were two members on the subcommittee. One was the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I was the other. I never worked with a man who tried to consider legislation in the light of his country's needs in a finer and better way than did the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. No; I cannot yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was proud and happy to serve with a man who had such a patriotic urge and disposition, and I can tell the Senate and I can tell the country that there was not one single partisan influence that motivated the Senator from New Jersey. He sought only his country's good, and I tried to help him in that endeavor. That is why I am so antagonistic against the procedure which we face here today. I expect to continue my antagonism until we can get an honest vote on the bill. I do not care about politics. If the passage of the bill would elect the Senator from Ohio President of the United States I would still vote for it; and I grant that is a considerable concession for a Democrat to make, and I say that with no reflection on the Senator from Ohio. I think he is an able, patriotic statesman, who also, in his way, and according to his lights, is trying to serve his country; but his lights, Mr. President, are terribly dim.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I call the Senator to order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was paying the Senator from Ohio a compliment, and if I lose the floor because I say that I consider the Senator from Ohio to be an honest, intelligent, patriotic statesman, I am willing to lose the floor. That is exactly what I have said. I did say that I thought his lights were terribly dim at times, and blinded. He makes some awful blunders and mistakes, just as I do, Mr. President.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Florida desires to propose a unanimous-consent request. I am perfectly willing to agree to his request provided I do not lose the floor. May I yield for that purpose?

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Florida be kind enough to tell us what the request is?

Mr. HATCH. May I yield for that purpose, without losing the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may yield for the purpose of having the Senator from Florida state what the unanimous-consent request is. At that point the Chair will decide what the position of the Senator from New Mexico will be from then on.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico. This is the situation. We have as a visitor today, a man who has just recently called on the President of the Senate, a member of the Senate of the Republic of Colombia. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and I on separate occasions had the honor to visit the Senate of Colombia, and this fellow senator has come to honor our body. Under our rules he has the privileges of the Senate floor. I merely want to rise in the Senate and state that we are happy to have him here, and allow the Senator from Rhode Island the same privilege. The Senator from Colombia does not expect to address the Senate, but we desire to accord honor to our visitor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I join in the unanimous-consent request of the Senator, upon the condition that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Reserving the right to object, I think it will be very enlightening for the Senator from Colombia to see the kind of procedure being followed in the Senate of the United States at this time. I have no objection.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Colombia is at the door at this moment, and the Senator from Florida is about to welcome him.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before our visitor arrives?

Mr. HATCH. If I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. How long does the Senator from New Mexico expect to hold the floor?

Mr. HATCH. I do not know. There are many things I want to say, and I am in no hurry about adjourning and going home, either.

Mr. LUCAS. I had hoped the Senator might give us some information about the matter, because there are important legislative matters to be taken up.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF HON. H. S. PARMENIO CÁRDENAS, A SENATOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate stand in informal recess to welcome a distinguished visitor, H. S. Parmenio Cárdenas, a Senator of the Republic of Colombia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senate will now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m. H. S. Parmenio Cárdenas, a Senator of the Republic of Colombia, escorted by Senator GREEN and Senator PEPPER, entered the Chamber and took the place assigned him in the well of the Senate, where he was introduced individually to the Members of the Senate.

At 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m. the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KNOWLAND) in the chair.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING FOR VETERANS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if we may have order, I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request to which Senators may listen. I should like to have a little bit of order and a little bit of listening——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from New Mexico is about to propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is immaterial that the Senator from Ohio is not interested. I merely wanted to join in the unanimous-consent request that he made a while ago, upon this one condition, that I be recognized after the measure he mentioned has been completed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object to that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, under those circumstances, of course, necessarily I must proceed. But I want the RECORD to show and I want the country to know, too, that I am perfectly willing to yield for the transaction of necessary business. I should be glad to yield to have taken up and disposed of veterans' legislation. The only thing I ask is that I be recognized when it is over. To that request, the Senator from Ohio objects—or does he?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think I objected. I do not know how often I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's objection was heard.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the record is written. May it so stand. But, Mr. President, I regard as unnecessary and uncalled for the situation in the Senate in which the effort is made to compel Senators to do things, to try to force them against their will. I shall be courteous, Mr. President, to those who are courteous to me. If discourtesy is shown to me, I regret to say that I shall be human enough to reply in kind.

Mr. President, I renew my request that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of veterans' legislation, and that at its conclusion I shall be recognized to address the Senate upon such subjects as I may care to discuss.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state the parliamentary situation. The Senator from New Mexico a few moments ago made a unanimous-consent request, to which objection was made. As the Chair understands, the Senator from New Mexico is now repeating what in effect is his unanimous-consent request, because due to the parliamentary situation the only way by which the purpose to which the Senator alludes could be effectuated is by unanimous consent of the Senate. Since the Senator has requested unanimous consent, the Chair must determine whether unanimous consent will be granted.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from New Mexico is withdrawn.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to make a suggestion to him.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I can yield and not lose the floor, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I agree to that condition, so far as I am concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that may be done.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday when the Senator from New Jersey sought consideration for his bill, there was some discussion. I told the Senator then, as I feel now, that if he would confine his bill to the investigation provided for at the end of the bill, section 10, it would be entirely agreeable to me. For some reason, the Chair ruled that the resolution then submitted by the Senator from New Jersey was not in order, and the resolution could not be taken up for immediate consideration, because of the unanimous-consent agreement then pending.

My position today is the same as it was yesterday. It seems to me that the cart has been put before the horse—to pass the bill, and then provide in section 10 for a commission to ascertain about it. If we are to have a commission to find out about it, let us have the commission first, and then we can write the kind of bill which the commission thinks should be written.

If the Senator from New Mexico would be satisfied with such a resolution, I do not think there would be objection, though I do not know. I would certainly have no objection. I think the resolution could be adopted at once, if that would be a suggested solution of the problem.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should not be satisfied with that resolution. I think the bill should pass. But, Mr. President, I am a practical man. I know something of the situation with which we are confronted. I am trying to get results. I am not merely talking for the sake of talking. As a matter of fact, the resolution to which the Senator refers was largely my own work; it was my resolution; and I think it should be adopted, whether the bill is passed or not; and because I believe in it, I am not going to assume a dog-in-the-manger attitude. If the Senator is willing now to agree to the resolution offered by the Senator from New Jersey, if I may ask unanimous consent that the resolution now be called up and acted upon, and that I not lose the floor by such request, I shall be glad to propound it. May I make the request upon those conditions?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what was the proposal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico suggests that if the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Jersey relative to an investigation of a matter in which the Senator is interested, relating to overseas broadcasts, and so forth, can be taken up now without jeopardizing the Senator's rights on the floor, he would certainly be willing to have it taken up at this time.

Mr. HATCH. Reserving the right to object, I will say to the distinguished Senator that if the resolution is adopted, I shall have no desire to continue my present discussion.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator be satisfied then that we may proceed with, so to speak, the general plan that has been made?

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has asked me a question, which I must answer truthfully and frankly. Even though the resolution should be adopted, if I had the opportunity, if I could be recognized to move to consider the original bill, I should do so. I shall not filibuster on that question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object, then, to the request.

Mr. HATCH. I am sorry, Mr. President. I have tried to reach an agreement. I thought I made myself perfectly clear.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HATCH. I cannot yield except for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator if it would interrupt his remarks if I should hand to him a list of the regular appropriation bills passed at this session of the Congress, showing the amount recommended by the budget, the amount passed by the House, the amount finally passed by the Congress, and the net reductions or increases in each bill, with the amount of the reduction in expenditures, for this session of

the Congress, in the appropriations as sent down by the budget department.

Mr. HATCH. No; it would not interrupt me. It would probably change my train of thought; and I have a definite train of thought, Mr. President. I should like to discuss the particular resolution to which reference has been made, and I should like to discuss the evidence before the committee of the House and before the Senate committee, as to the meaning of the bill itself to the country.

I should like to, and I shall if I am compelled to, Mr. President, take up, witness by witness, the testimony which has been given, to show to the Senate how important this measure is and how wrong it is for the Congress to adjourn and go home without taking action on it. Those words are beginning to have a significance for me and a connotation which I do not like, because I realize that the bills on the Senate calendar, while considerable in number, are not nearly so numerous as the bills which remain in the various committees of the Senate. In the Committee on Public Lands, of which I am a member, there are many bills which have not yet been acted upon and will not be acted upon if we adjourn on Saturday and go home and leave our work unfinished and undone.

Mr. President, I have talked about this subject before, but I am very earnest in what I say, that there is not a businessman in the country, conducting a large or small business, who would lock his doors and go home for 5 or 6 months' vacation. After all, Mr. President, the business of Congress is business. I, for one, happen to believe that it is my business. I, for one, believe that the duties we discharge here day by day are of far greater significance perhaps than any of us realize.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator could frame the suggestion in the form of a question so I would not lose the floor I should be delighted to yield to my colleague, who has worked so hard on this proposal, I may say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico yields for a question.

Mr. SMITH. May I put a preamble to my question by saying that I want to express to my colleague my appreciation of the work we did together on the bill, and my intense interest in the bill. But in the interest of making progress now, I am going to ask the Senator from New Mexico if it is possible for us to bring up immediately, by unanimous consent, Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, which is the resolution the Senator from New Mexico himself originally drafted, and which was previously section 10 of the bill we are discussing; and whether if we can have that resolution adopted the Senator from New Mexico will be willing to yield the floor in order that we may proceed with our program?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Jersey if he believes the adoption of the resolution by the Senate today would meet with the concurrence of the House? Has the Senator spoken with any Members of the House on the subject?

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the Senator that I talked with the author of the Mundt bill, and of course while he and I both would like to see the measure acted upon at this session, I think the author of the bill, Representative MUNDT himself, feels that if we can have the resolution adopted, so the investigation can be made this summer, our bill still will be on the calendar and can be brought up, if we want to have it considered on the opening day of the session in January, and we can receive a report, favorable or unfavorable, from the committee which would go to Europe to study the matter without at all abandoning the proposal in which we are so much interested. I do not want to misquote Representative MUNDT, but I believe he would agree with me that that would be the wisest course to pursue.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the light of what the Senator from New Jersey has said, I now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 29. To the distinguished Senator from Ohio I will say that I shall make no conditions to that request as to my regaining the floor. If necessary I will take my own chances on securing the floor. I make that request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 29?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished Senator from New Mexico agree to a time limitation under which the resolution might be discussed?

Mr. HATCH. I do not think it needs any discussion. Simply call it up, and it will speak for itself. Let the Senator from New Jersey read it.

Mr. WHERRY. And adopt it without any debate?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I very much hope that the suggestion made by the Senator from New Jersey will have the prompt approval of the Senate. I happen to be one of those who did not look with favor, and who does not look with favor now, on the bill as a whole, but I can wholeheartedly support the appointment of a committee and the study of all the problems involved. I very much hope the resolution will be promptly adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to call attention to the fact that since July 17 the pending business has been the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 150, to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of Senate Resolution 116. That has been the pending business since July 17. I am at a loss to understand why, under the present circumstances, a request should come from the other side of the aisle for unanimous consent to take up another matter ahead of that matter which is now pending before the Senate, and until and unless some fair and equitable arrangement is made for a vote on my resolution, I propose to object to any request for a unanimous consent coming from any of the gentlemen who have participated directly or indirectly in the filibuster against the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to have my resolution considered.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I will say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator permit the Presiding Officer to state the parliamentary situation? The Senator from New Mexico has not lost his right to the floor. The Chair is trying to protect him in his right. But the Senate should proceed in an orderly fashion. The Chair understands that the Senator from New Mexico temporarily permitted this discussion to take place to see if we could not arrive at a unanimous-consent arrangement, and the Chair feels that, as a matter of good faith, the Senator from New Mexico is still entitled to the floor if that arrangement cannot be worked out.

The Chair understands that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has objected to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from New Mexico. Objection having been heard, the situation returns to the state in which it was prior to the discussion which has just taken place.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that when a unanimous-consent request is submitted and an objection is then made, the Senator necessarily loses the floor, and that therefore the Senator from New Mexico has spoken four or five times on the same subject, which is the so-called Kem resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that we have been proceeding on a basis whereby the Senator from New Mexico has not been willing to yield, except for the purpose of answering questions. At the request of the Senator from New Jersey an attempt was made to secure a unanimous-consent agreement. It was the Chair's understanding that the Senator from New Mexico would not have yielded for that purpose except with the express understanding that his position on the floor would not be jeopardized. For that reason the Chair will rule that, objection having been made, under the conditions as stated, the Senator from New Mexico now has the floor, and is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. Not now. I wish to make an observation or two.

The ruling of the Chair is the kind, fair sort of ruling which I would expect from the Senator from California.

But the objection that I had lost the floor when I was trying to be courteous, when I was trying to be fair, is not fair, and is not just. It does not do the Senator from Ohio credit.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. No; I will not yield, because the Senator will object and say that I have lost the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all.

Mr. HATCH. No; I will not yield, and I do not yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to say that I did not object.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not yield. The Senator from Ohio is violating the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield. The Senator from New Mexico will proceed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should like to have some definite understanding. For the first time in the history of the United States Senate, I venture to say, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has said that he would not agree to a unanimous-consent request because it came from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. I do not yield; but I heard the Senator from Missouri——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I wish to say——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield.

Mr. HATCH. The question as to whether a unanimous-consent request should be agreed to——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HATCH. I do not yield for any purpose.

Mr. President, the question in this body always ought to be, when a request is proposed, Is it a fair request? Is it a reasonable request? and not whether it comes from a Republican or a Democrat.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. But, Mr. President, I bow to the powers that be. I bow to majority which controls this body. I now wish to propose a unanimous-consent agreement, first, that I do not lose the flood by so doing.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] may be recognized in order that he may propound a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question from the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HATCH. Yes; I yield for a question only.

Mr. KEM. Did the Senator from New Mexico correctly understand me when I said that I would not agree to a unanimous-consent request coming from any Senator who participated directly or indirectly in the filibuster against the pending business, in which I am interested?

Mr. HATCH. I did not so understand the Senator. I am sorry if I misunderstood him.

But, Mr. President, I have the floor, and I think the implication of the Senator from Missouri was perfectly plain. Earlier in the day when he propounded his request I said, not once, but twice, that I would not object to it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield.

Then, for some strange reason known best to himself, the Senator from Missouri objected to my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. President, I want my unanimous-consent request submitted to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey may propound a unanimous-consent request without my losing the floor by reason of extending to him the courtesy of making the request.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have a parliamentary situation in which the interest of the public business should be facilitated as much as possible. It is difficult for the Chair, unless sufficient time is given to the Chair, to state the parliamentary situation or the requests.

The request has been made by the Senator from New Mexico for unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] may be permitted temporarily to displace the unfinished business with his resolution.

At this point the Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to see whether he wishes to make an objection to the request. The position of the Senator from New Mexico has not been jeopardized up to this point.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that no Member of this body has a higher regard for the Senator from New Jersey than I have. It is difficult to decline any request which he makes. However, when he acts for and on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico it is necessary to apply the maxim facit per alium facit per se.

It is clear that the request is made by the Senator from New Jersey at the request of the Senator from New Mexico. I previously objected to the request of the Senator from New Mexico, and I now object to the request of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. In order that the Senator from New Mexico may understand why I am objecting, let me tell him again. He previously stated that it was for some strange reason known only to myself. Let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that the reason I am objecting to his request is that it comes from a Senator who participated in the filibuster and is now participating in the filibuster against the unfinished business.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have another idea. I am still trying to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. BALDWIN and Mr. SMITH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I yield only to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Mexico if he will yield the floor to me for the purpose of——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair say that so long as the Senator from New Mexico has the floor the Senator from New Mexico is entitled to yield for a question, or to yield provided he can obtain unanimous consent to do so without jeopardizing his position. The Chair wishes to state that so long as the present occupant of the chair occupies that position, once the Senator from New Mexico takes his seat, the Chair understands that his duty as presiding officer is to recognize such Senator as he believes to be entitled to the floor under the rules of the Senate. The Chair will not bind himself to recognize any particular Senator. That will have to rest in the judgment of the Chair.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I regret very much the situation which prevails. I should be very happy to agree with my friends on the other side to any plan that can be devised for taking up the concurrent resolution and passing it. I have made every conceivable gesture I know how to make, and I do not know what to do under the circumstances except to continue to hold the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I should be glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey. I should be delighted to have him present the concurrent resolution for consideration and strike my name from it. I should be glad to have him present it in his own right if that could be done by my yielding to him; but the situation is such that I simply cannot do it. I know that the Presiding Officer cannot give any advance information that he will recognize the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I cannot yield. I think I have been just as courteous and kind as I could have been.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair respectfully suggests that if the Senator should decide to yield the floor, he might leave it to the discretion of the Presiding Officer as to who should be recognized at that point.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have never had too much trouble with presiding officers, whether the President pro tempore or someone else. I have found that inherent within them is the element of decency and fair dealing which can always be trusted.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Before presenting the concurrent resolution, let me say to the Senator from Missouri that I originally submitted the concurrent resolution yesterday. It was my resolution, and I invited the Senator from New Mexico to join me in sponsoring it. I submitted it for myself, as one of the proponents of the bill to which reference has been made. I want to see the concurrent resolution passed in order to have the investigation continued during the adjournment.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 29, and ask that it be passed by unanimous consent, if that can be done.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 29. Is there objection?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

Mr. BALDWIN. Reserving the right to object, let me say that I am deeply interested in the Mundt resolution. I believe that we must take some such action as is suggested in that resolution. Whether this particular measure is a correct one I am not now prepared to say. But I do say this, Mr. President, that there are on the calendar matters of great importance to the whole country. There is on the calendar a resolution calling for a study and examination of consumer prices, in order that we might do something to stop the inflationary trend of prices of the things which people eat, wear, and use in their homes. There is on the calendar a bill which deals with the matter of housing. There is a bill which deals with the whole system of promotions for the Army and Navy, which is designed to integrate a program of promotion into law so that we may have a sound measure for the promotion of our officers in the Army and the Navy. That is vitally important, because they need to be assured of their future. There is a bill giving a widowed mother of a veteran lost in the war equal status with veterans' widows under the civil service in which the Senator from Maryland and I are interested—

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor. He asked for unanimous consent to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 29 and temporarily lay aside the pending business. The Senator from Connecicut objected to that and is now, as the Chair understands it, giving his explanation for his objection.

Mr. SMITH. He reserved the right to object. I would like to say to the Senator from Connecticut that I am perfectly willing to limit debate on the resolution to 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, if by the process of seizing the floor and threatening to hold it indefinitely a Senator can delay business of great importance to this Nation, in order to get a vote on his bill, then every other Senator in this body is entitled to exercise the same privilege; and the result will be utter confusion. Under the rules of the Senate there is provision for a policy committee which, Mr. President, is charged with the job of organizing the procedure of the business of the Senate. Otherwise we would get nowhere. The policy committee, through its chairman, has announced the procedure which we are trying to follow in order that we may adjourn on the day set. I object, Mr. President, to this method of seizing the floor and holding up business indefinitely. This is a method which can be used to advance a bill in which a Senator may be particularly interested. I say that, Mr. President, because there are pending before the Senate matters of very grave importance, at least as important as is the resolution in which the distinguished Senator from New Jersey is interested and the bill in which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is interested.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 29 be placed at the end of today's calendar, where it will be reached when the calendar is called. We fully intend to call the calendar before we adjourn today.

Mr. HATCH. Reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor. He yielded it temporarily to the Senator from Ohio who offered a unanimous-consent request that Senate Concurrent Resolution 29 be placed at the end of the calendar, where it will be called when the calendar is called today. As the Chair understands, the Senator from New Mexico has reserved the right to object to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Preliminary to an objection, I want to say that the words of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] are entirely uncalled for. The Reorganization Act does not create a policy committee to dictate to and run the Senate of the United States. When the Senate assumes that it has to bow down, there will not be any business conducted. That is not my attitude. I have tried my best to get any kind of an agreement I could get. I think the suggestion which was made by the Senator from Ohio is a very good one. I shall not object to it. I hope it may be agreed to. I hope the concurrent resolution may go to the end of the calendar, as he has said, and then before the day is over we may at least discuss it. I join with the Senator from Ohio in the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. Reserving the right to object, I should like to take advantage of the opportunity to ask the Senator from Ohio what prospect there is that we will get to the bills to which the able Senator from Connecticut referred as being so important?

Mr. TAFT. I think there is every prospect, may I say to the Senator, if we can proceed. There is an agreement for a time limitation on two veterans' bills. The sugar bill, which is of present importance, will not take very long. The Senator from West Virginia tells me that his resolution which follows will not take more than an hour. He will yield, and the calendar will then be called. That should certainly be within less than 3 hours, I should think.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that he has not included in his enumeration any one of the three bills which I consider to be very important. I refer to the investigation of the high cost of living——

Mr. TAFT. Those bills are on the calendar and are to be called. I hope they will go through. If they do not, I shall be glad to move to take them up.

Mr. LODGE. I refer to the study of the high cost of living, the study of what is the matter with the housing situation, and the bill to remove the deadwood from the Regular Army, without doing which we cannot in good conscience ask the mothers of America to let their sons go into the service. There are a lot of dodos that have to be weeded out.

Mr. TAFT. Those bills are on the calendar, and we have every intention of calling them. We hope that they will go through promptly.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection.

Mr. SMITH. The understanding is now that the resolution for which I asked consideration will go at the end of the calendar and will be reached some time today?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. I have no objection.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 610, House bill 2181, and that the debate on the bill be limited to 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LODGE. I object. The bill is utterly discriminatory to Massachusetts and Illinois, and, I think, possibly to Wisconsin.

Mr. TAFT. I did not propose the bill myself, but the committee agreed to put it on the calendar. It was my purpose to vote to recommit it to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions to make a thorough study of all on-the-job training. The Senator is also free to move to amend the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, does the Senator intend to move to recommit the bill?

Mr. TAFT. That is my motion; but, of course, the Senator from Oregon will oppose it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I object. This is a very discriminatory measure, as it stands; and I object to having it taken up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the pending business be postponed until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say that the purpose of my motion is to remove the unanimous-consent requirement, so that we may take up bills on motion, in the order which I have indicated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the pending business be postponed until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar as indicated:

H. R. 4326. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4140. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING FOR VETERANS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2181, Calendar No. 610.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that motion is debatable; is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. LODGE. I intend to discuss it.

Mr. President, I wish to say at the outset that I am in favor of the objectives of this bill. I believe that on-the-farm training is a most desirable thing. But I say so, having in mind the very happy and successful experience which we have had with it in Massachusetts.

So I say that on-the-farm training is a very desirable activity. It is one which has been conducted with success and benefit to young men in my State and in a great many other States, and I definitely believe that this institutional on-the-farm training program should be recognized in all parts of the country as a full-time training program. But I definitely do not agree that House bill 2181, to which we have arrived now by a rather peculiar series of motions, is the answer to this problem.

The part of the bill to which I vigorously object is section 4 (c), which requires organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least 200 hours per year at an educational or training institution, before the on-the-farm training can qualify under this bill. In other words, this bill makes the mistake which, unhappily, so often is made here: it completely ignores the man who is engaged in urbanized agriculture.

Millions of people are engaged in urbanized agriculture. The amount of compensation which they would receive under this bill, as compared with that received by other persons in agriculture, is a very sorry thing. In Massachusetts, and perhaps in various other States, for some time we have had a real on-the-farm program. A large number of veterans engaged in this program are employed in agricultural work, rather than on their own farms. There is the point to be remembered. The man who works, let us say, for the Carnation Milk Co. or for the Deerfoot Co., a company in my own State which makes sausage, is engaged in agriculture, but not in the same way that a man who owns his own farm is engaged in agriculture. The difference is that the time of the man in the first-mentioned group is not his own. These people, working, as they are, under the Massachusetts program, must spend at least 48 hours a week on operational, skilled training on the farm, even though that means a total of 50 or 60 hours a week or more. These veterans could not possibly hope to meet the requirement for 200 hours of instruction at some institution, which this bill imposes as a minimum requirement.

It seems to me, and I am sure it will seem to you, Mr. President, and to anyone else who stops to consider the bill candidly, that it is utterly unrealistic to suppose that a veteran could reasonably expect to go somewhere for 200 hours a year, and also continue in a job on a farm at the same time. His job would suffer very materially. If that much time is taken out of a man's job, the job will not amount to anything. Even if the job were not completely destroyed, although in most cases I think it would be, it certainly would not be a real job; it would be just part time.

Mr. President, I am reliably informed that the enactment of this bill would mean that at least 75 percent of the veterans engaged in the program in Massachusetts would be dropped out. I certainly cannot subscribe to a measure which will have such an effect.

A moment ago I referred to Illinois. I have before me a letter from Mr. J. E. Hill, who is the State supervisor of the agricultural education program at Springfield, Mass. Mr. Hill writes under date of July 17, 1947, as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
VERNON D. NICKELL, EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
Springfield, July 17, 1947.

I have your letter of July 10 giving additional information concerning the status of H. R. 2181. I sincerely hope that H. R. 2181 as originally submitted does not pass. The Lodge amendment—

That is the amendment which I submitted this winter, to take care of the situation—

would change the bill so that it would be completely satisfactory to Illinois. H. R. 2181 without the Lodge amendment—

Mr. President, note this carefully—

would completely disrupt our program and reduce our enrollment from some 15,000 to 7,000 or less.

Assuring you that I appreciate your efforts in helping solve this problem satisfactorily, I remain,

Yours very truly,

J. E. HILL,
State Supervisor, Agricultural Education.

Mr. President, it would be unreasonable to expect me to support legislation which would have that effect in my State, and which I believe would have a similar effect in other States. I feel that there is a good proposition here, but that the bill is half-baked, has not been thought through or fully analyzed or carefully drafted.

The bill seeks to impose rigid bureaucratic standards on the States, and it seeks to put the farm boy into a bed of Procrustes, to stretch him out if he is too short for it, or to jam him in if he is too long for it—all in the name of uniform standards, if you please.

I was astounded to hear the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] say last night that the States are not measuring up to the minimum standards. I think that statement creates a very false impression. The point is that the standards are different—not that the standards are better. The standards set forth in this bill are different.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. What I meant to say was that so far as I was concerned I had no objection to any amendment. I did express the hope that it would not lower the minimum standards which were fixed in the bill. They may not be very high, as it is. I do not know that I have the slightest objection to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I very much appreciate the Senator's statement. It is characteristic of the Senator from Georgia to make it. It may be that I misunderstood. I thought I heard him say last night that the States which could not come in under the program were not up to the standards of the law, and I do not believe that is the case at all.

Mr. President, I will make my point clear by giving some examples. Let us take the case of veteran Jones. He works, let us suppose, on one of the large commercial dairy farms, such as Carnation Milk or Deerfoot Farms in my own State. He wants to start in and learn the dairy business on that farm from the bottom to the top. They start him out in the feed department, and he works a minimum of 48 hours a week, and probably from 56 to 60 hours in all. This bill would require him, in addition, to participate in 200 hours of classroom instruction at some school.

A man can take on just so much work and no more. He needs a little time to himself for rest and recreation. So veteran Jones quite rightly feels that he ought to be treated the same way as his friend veteran Smith, who is taking on-the-job training in, let us suppose, a Ford agency, is treated. The Ford agency is not obliged to say to veteran Smith: "All right, you want to prepare yourself to be in the Ford agency business. We will put you out on the floor and we will start you in with a grease job, and from there on we will move you on up to the

mechanical department, but, Mr. Smith, you will have to attend, in addition, at least 200 hours a year in addition to your full day here in classroom work at the school in the next town." Veteran Smith learns his job on the job—that is why these benefits are called on-the-job-training benefits.

The GI bill has entirely different prerequisites for veterans who desire formal schooling. A man can go to an agricultural school, under this bill, if that is the way he wants to learn how to be a farmer. But most educators agree that the best way to learn the ins and outs of farming is to learn it on the farm and not in a classroom. In my opinion, it is something of a joke to call this bill on-farm-training bill, when it requires—and I want to stress this—something which no other type of on-the-job training requires, namely, a minimum of 200 hours of classroom instruction.

I do not say that a certain amount of classroom instruction may not be wholly desirable in certain allied agricultural subjects. I do not want to take the time to go into that right now, but I would be the first to realize that it is probably more effective to teach certain subjects in the classroom rather than on the farm. I want to be reasonable about this. What I object to is for us to say in this bill: "You must have 200 hours of classroom instruction or else you can't qualify for these benefits." That is bureaucracy, rigidity, at its worst. The varying situations in different States may call for entirely different approaches. In some States or in some communities it may be perfectly feasible to have 200 hours of assembled, classroom instruction. In other States, the training program may call for only 100 hours, or 50 hours, or 10 hours. I do not think it possible to make a hard and fast rule about a subject like this, but that is precisely what this bill seeks to do. And if it would spell certain disaster to the Massachusetts program, as I am told it would, I wonder what effect it would have in such States as Wyoming, or Montana, or Texas, or Georgia, where the distances from farm to classroom are double and triple what they are in the East. The answer seems perfectly clear to me: There just will not be any veterans enrolling in on-farm training, and accordingly the activity will be wasted.

From the very moment that H. R. 2181 was introduced in the Senate, I have been trying to find a solution to this problem. As I said earlier, I favor the objectives of the bill, and I want to see it passed in such a form that it not only can be made realistic and workable, but also in such a form that it will not ruin programs which have operated successfully and effectively to date in my own State of Massachusetts and in several other States.

Therefore, I offered an amendment to the bill which would have solved this difficulty. It simply provided that where it is discovered that a variation in the proportion of hours of assembled instruction and individual instruction will better serve the conditions within a given area, any program mutually agreeable to the regional office of the Veterans' Administration and the responsible State authority which substantially meets the total number of training hours called for in the act shall be recognized as complying with the requirements of the act. In other words, the amendment provided the flexibility in this matter of classroom work which those who have had practical experience with that type of farm training believed necessary. My amendment did not disturb the total hours or any other provision of the bill. All it sought to do was to loosen the entirely too rigid provisions regarding the proportion of hours of assembled instruction and individual instruction.

By requiring the approval of the regional office of the Veterans' Administration and the State approving agency, my amendment safeguards the program against the certification of any spurious or illusory programs. So nobody can make that objection.

For reasons unknown to me, the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported the bill without my amendment, although full hearings were held on it and, I understand, the chairman of the subcommittee, the able junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] expressed himself as being wholly satisfied that the amendment was proper and necessary, and he helped it along.

However, since the bill was reported without what I consider to be an absolutely vital provision, I am forced to register my objection to the entire bill. I feel in this case it is certainly better to have no legislation at all than have such a bill as H. R. 2181 on the books.

Mr. President, I have here the testimony in the hearing before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Mr. Harold A. Mostrom, of Massachusetts, who is a great authority on on-the-farm training, the director of the Essex County Agricultural School, in Athol, Mass., testified. I should like to read a few excerpts from what he said:

> Mr. MOSTROM. Well, without any amendment, we believe that because the program calls for 200 hours of assembled instruction, that the great majority of our veteran students would have to drop out of the program, because a large portion of those in training are engaged in employed agricultural work rather than on their own farms. Their time is not their own, and because they are working under our program of a minimum of 48 hours a week on operational skilled training on the farm, and for most of them that means 50 or 60 hours a week or more, they feel that they could not possibly meet a requirement that called for them to be off the farm a total of 200 hours during the year.

Mr. President, I could proceed and talk about this for 4 or 5 hours, in fact, I could probably talk about it for 15 or 16 hours. I do not want to say I could beat the record in the Senate for length of time, but I feel I could at least equal it. But I am not going to do that. I have made just a brief statement of the facts in the case, and I hope that the motion which has been made by the Senator from Ohio will not prevail. If it does prevail, then I shall offer the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have a vote on the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2181, relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator understand there is a time limitation upon the debate in the agreement?

Mr. TAFT. Such a request is agreeable to the Senators who are interested but other Senators may object. I cannot agree for them. Senators interested in the bill have agreed to such a limitation.

Mr. LODGE. I am interested. The Senator did not speak for me?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Massachusetts is interested. I cannot speak for him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to consider calendar 610, House bill 2181, an act relating to institution on-farm training for veterans. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. LODGE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2181) relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 2, lines 16 and 17, to strike out "Administrator, which when taken as a full time course," and insert "Administrator. Such course shall be considered a full-time course when it"; and on page 4, line 25, after the word "found", to insert "by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or the State approving agency."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions to make a thorough study of all on-the-job and on-the-farm training. I propose to make the same motion with regard to the next bill, which deals with on-the-job training. Mr. President, I make that motion simply in order that it may be before the Senate. It is debatable.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Was consent given to limited debate?

Mr. TAFT. I want to make the motion, first——

Mr. GEORGE. I merely want to state that I have no objection to a limitation on debate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the motion be limited to 15 minutes on each side, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Oregon and myself. I shall be glad to yield the most of my time to the Senator from Massachusetts, if he wishes to take it, in connection with his amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the bill, and I want to

have sufficient time to explain it and the reasons for it. In light of past experience, 15 minutes does not go very far—a Senator yields to someone, who immediately is off to the races, and the 15 minutes is gone.

Mr. TAFT. I confine my unanimous consent request to action on the motion to refer. If that motion is defeated, then the Senator may proceed to offer his amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I discussed at some length this measure last night, and I do not care to repeat what I then said. The Senator from Oregon, in charge of the bill, will have full control of it. I of course express the hope that the bill will not be recommitted.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, is it in order for me to take about 2 minutes to read a short statement?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Do I have the floor?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I withhold my request until the Senator from Maryland makes a short statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to put in the RECORD a short statement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In answer to the question propounded by the junior Senator from Oregon——

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Oregon that I shall not take more than 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that.

Mr. TAFT. I propounded a unanimous consent request which has not been acted on. I suggested I would withhold that until the Senator from Maryland presented a short statement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator propounds the request, I have no objection to his doing so in my time; but I think the record is that I have the floor. I was recognized by the Chair, and I have not yielded the floor. I permitted the Senator from Ohio to proceed, and I should have no objection to permitting the Senator from Maryland to proceed. The parliamentary inquiry I desire to raise is, Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First, however, is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TAFT. I withhold the request until the Senator's statement has been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order to keep the Senator in position where he will not lose the floor, I would like to ask him if he knows that the figures I am about to give have been prepared by the experts of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and show the name of the appropriation bill, the amount of the budget request for each appropriation bill, the amount of the bill as it passed the House, and the amount of the bill as it passed the Congress, or the Senate, in the event that it has not reached the President, and the net saving on each bill. Let me say on the 14 regular appropriation bills, the reduction below the Budget Bureau's estimates, according to the figures of the Senate Appropriations Committee, are as follows:

The Treasury-Post Office bill, $882,614,100; Labor-Federal Security bill, $105,455,000; the hoof-and-mouth disease appropriations, nothing; Interior Department appropriation bill, $102,135,000; State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, the amount of reduction is $147,613,000; the Navy appropriation bill, $244,234,000; the agricultural appropriation bill, $190,141,000; the military establishment bill, $100,173,000; the government corporations appropriations bill, $18,391,000; the independent offices appropriation bill, $192,519,000; the legislative appropriation bill, $20,899,000; the War Department civil functions appropriation bill, an increase of $157,200,000; the District of Columbia appropriation bill, a reduction of $293,000; and the supplemental appropriation bill, $246,607,000, making a total reduction in government expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, of $2,093,000,000. That does not include the $800,000,000 of tax refunds, which were taken out of an appropriation bill, but the $800,000,000 in tax refunds was not a reduction in governmental expenditures, so that the net reduction in governmental expenditures for the fiscal year that has taken place was $1,293,875,000. The amount of money recommended by the Budget Bureau to the Congress on all these bills was $27,948,583,089. The amount of the bills, as they passed the Congress, was $25,854,708,081, leaving a net reduction in the House and Senate on the bills in question of $1,293,875,000.

I mentioned this only to bring out the point that that is the extent to which the Appropriations Committee in the House and in the Senate, and the House and the Senate thereafter, have reduced the recommendations of the Budget Bureau in cutting the expenditures of the Federal Government.

I should like to have this table printed in the RECORD in detail for all to see. It does not take into consideration, either, any deficiency appropriations which may be passed after we convene in January, nor does it take into consideration the $400,000,000 of authorization for the armed services only a few days ago, and has just recently passed, but for which appropriations will not be made, in part, until January; so that unless we have swollen revenues, as a result of increased prosperity in the country resulting from the present rates, it is not likely that we will have any surplus in the Treasury on June 30, 1948. However, if we continue to hold down expenses and if we continue to receive these abnormal revenues due to prosperity in the country, the prospect of a surplus will be rather bright. But as of the moment we face the fiscal year 1948 with only a reduction of $1,293,000,000 in the estimates of the Budget Bureau, or the Presidential estimates. I think the country should know that. I have been working with the staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee in preparing this table, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in detail in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriations, fiscal year 1948

Bill	(1) Budget request	(2) House passed	(3) Passed Congress or Senate	Difference between Budget request and final action
Treasury-Post Office	$4,099,123,550	$3,202,050,750	$3,216,509,450	[1] $882,614,100
Labor-Federal Security	1,779,614,039	1,684,586,780	1,674,158,631	105,455,408
Hoof and mouth	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	
Interior	296,135,000	161,413,000	194,000,000	102,135,000
State-Justice-Commerce	698,788,000	538,976,000	551,175,000	147,613,000
Navy	3,513,000,000	3,135,481,000	3,268,766,000	244,234,000
Agriculture	805,141,000	572,172,000	615,000,000	190,141,000
Military Establishment	5,716,791,500	5,280,982,000	5,616,618,000	100,173,500
Government corporations	50,137,000	36,097,000	31,746,000	18,391,000
Independent offices	8,500,497,000	8,167,869,000	8,307,978,000	192,519,000
Legislative	76,153,000	54,895,000	55,254,000	20,899,000
War civil functions	382,727,000	339,186,000	539,927,000	[2] 157,200,000
District of Columbia	95,793,000	95,930,000	95,500,000	293,000
Supplemental	1,925,683,000	1,603,199,000	1,679,076,000	246,607,000
Total	27,948,583,089	24,942,537,530	25,854,708,081	2,093,875,008
Less tax-refund reduction				800,000,000
Actual reduction				1,293,875,008

[1] Includes $800,000,000 tax-refund reduction.
[2] Increase over President's original request.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. 609. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims arising out of the deaths of Norman Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris;

S. 1505. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce;

S. 1590. An act to amend the District of Columbia rent-control law so as to provide that schools and universities may recover possession of housing accommodations in certain cases;

S. 1633. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947, and the national convention of the Veterans of

Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, September 4 to 9, 1947;

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution relating to safety in bituminous-coal and lignite mines of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to provide for returns of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 629) for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; P. W. Woodyard and J. R. Mahon; B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. B. Lacy; G. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox; W. W. Cox and Dr. J. W. Cox; Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1326) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, with an amendment; insisted upon its amendment; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HOPE, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. FLANNAGAN, and Mr. COOLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended with an amendment; insisted upon its amendment; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VORYS, Mr. JUDD, Mr. FULTON, Mr. RICHARDS, and Mr. MANSFIELD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 4069. An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II; and

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

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 Senate to the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, and 92 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 16, 21, and 24, to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Harriett Townsend Bottomley; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JENNINGS, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. FEIGHAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4263) making supplemental appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, insisting upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CORDON, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. MCFARLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

RELIEF OF ACCOUNTABLE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1350) to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes, which were on page 1, line 11, strike out "for any reason whatsoever", and on page 2, strike out all after line 13, down to and including line 2, on page 3, and insert:

SEC. 2. This act shall not operate to repeal the provisions of the paragraph of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, relating to relief of disbursing officers of the Navy (41 Stat. 132; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 105), and the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge," approved December 13, 1944 (58 Stat. 800; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 95a).

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, insisting upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1326) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. STEWART conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN SECOND-CLASS MAILING PRIVILEGES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2857) to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. LANGER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LANGER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. MCKELLAR conferees on the part of the Senate.

HARRIETT TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Harriett Townsend Bottomley, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WILEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MOORE, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. KILGORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1937—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCCARTHY submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs,

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 amendment of the House numbered 1 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The United States or any State or local public agency assisted by Federal funds made available with respect to housing shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations (except as provided in the proviso of section 209 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947) operated by it where such action or proceeding is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such accommodations are administered, but no such action or proceeding shall be maintained prior to March 1, 1948, if in the opinion of the administering authority such action or proceeding would result in undue hardship for the occupants of such housing accommodations, or unless in the opinion of such authority other housing facilities are available for such occupants."

And the House agree to the same.

JOE MCCARTHY,
J. WM. FULBRIGHT,
By J. M.,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
By J. M.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

CONTROL OF DANGEROUS WEAPONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KEM submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition), having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 4 of the act entitled 'An Act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes', approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition), be amended by changing the last period to a colon and adding the following language: 'Provided, That arrests, without a warrant, and searches and seizures pursuant thereto, may be made for violation of this section, by police officers, as in the case of a felony, upon probable cause that the person arrested is violating this section at the time of the arrest; but no evidence discovered in the course of any arrest, search, or seizure authorized by this proviso shall be admissible in any criminal proceeding against the person arrested unless at the time of such arrest he was carrying a pistol or other dangerous weapon on or about his person.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend section 4 of the Act entitled 'An Act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes', approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition)."

JAMES P. KEM,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOS. P. O'HARA,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KEM. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report. I call attention to the fact that the report was signed by all the conferees with the exception of the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to be registered as voting against the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GURNEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, 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 amendment numbered 36.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 26, 27, 28, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,388,286,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,469,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,549,755,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,170,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$154,032,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$83,299,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$699,646,960"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$374,055,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$82,474,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$829,272,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$430,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$69,534,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$129,386,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$191,353,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$320,739,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$245,532,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,890,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$134,000,000" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$67,828,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$43,039,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 16, 19, 21, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, and 92.

CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
STYLES BRIDGES,
ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3678, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 25, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, and 92 to the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment insert "$5,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment insert "$2,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment insert "$2,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment insert "$15,000,000."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 16, 21, and 24.

The motion was agreed to.

DEATH OF ROBERT J. WATT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement before the limitation of debate becomes effective. I have just been informed that Mr. Robert J. Watt, who was the workers' delegate at the ILO, and who for the past many years has represented our country at international labor conferences, suddenly died on shipboard on the way back home. He was a friend of practically every Member of the United States Senate, and I know all Members of the Senate will be shocked, as I was shocked, to hear the news of the death of Mr. Watt.

When I left Geneva Mr. Watt apparently was in the best of health, and was carrying on in his usual splendid way and contributing much to the deliberations which took place there. He also contributed much to the establishment of good will between our country and other countries. He was the chairman of the labor group at the ILO Conference this year. That was a great honor bestowed upon him and upon America also.

I know Members of the Senate will be sad, as I am sad, at hearing this news.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that the news just announced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is indeed shocking to the junior Senator from Oregon. Bob Watt was one of my very close personal friends. I worked with him continuously for 2 years on the War Labor Board. He was a great labor statesman. Labor and employers and the public generally have suffered the loss of a great leadership so sorely needed in these critical times.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we have just received the sad intelligence of the death of Mr. Watt. I wish to say that I was associated with him rather intimately in the United Nations when it had its organization meeting in London in January and February of 1946.

Mr. Watt was a man of fine personality. He was an outstanding labor representative. But he was more than that. He was a representative of all our people, with a broad grasp of public affairs, and he contributed much toward the successful meetings in London, in which I was intimately associated with him.

In the contest which took place there we were resisting the recognition of what was known as the WFTU, the World Federation of Trade Unions, which was largely communistic in its membership, and which included most of the communistic labor organizations of Europe. We successfully prevented its being recognized as a member of the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

At a later meeting in New York that organization was given limited and indirect representation, but Mr. Watt aided us effectively and resisted diligently and vigorously the aggressive tactics of that organization, communistic as it was in its nature.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am deeply shocked and personally grieved to hear the news of the death of Robert J. Watt. He was a citizen of Lawrence, Mass., and was the legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor at the State House in Boston at the time I was chairman of the house committee on labor and industry. I worked with him very closely. I came to know him very well. Never did a man work more diligently and more effectively to perform the duties assigned to him. Never was there a man who worked harder for what he believed to be the right, and he fought with skill.

Mr. Watt was a man of his word. Men could absolutely count on every statement he made. He was a constructive figure. He was a believer that the greatness of America fundamentally lies in American unity. For that reason he was peculiarly well fitted to represent the United States abroad at this time in world history when there are so many selfish people who are seeking to preach hatred between man and man.

He was a fine father, husband, and friend.

I last saw him a few months ago in the Foreign Relations Committee room before his departure for Europe, and he was in his usual state of good humor and confident optimism.

I mourn his passing, and I hope his family and those he left behind will derive the strength to which they are entitled from the thought of his life, so full of service to his fellow men.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to add a brief word to what has been said by my colleague from Massachusetts respecting Robert J. Watt, who was a personal friend of mine for the last 24 years. I watched him steadily grow in stature. I saw him start as the legislative agent of the A. F. of L. council, become its secretary-treasurer, and then come to Washington, and later become a well-known international figure.

Mr. Watt was always friendly. I know how proud he was of his wife and his boy and his girl, and of the career his children have made for themselves with his help.

As a citizen of Massachusetts, engaged in politics and in government affairs, I have been personally helped by Robert J. Watt on many different occasions.

I have had many interesting arguments with him and have always regarded him to be a man of great intellectual capacity and integrity, and with a fine sense of humor.

I join with my colleague and other Senators in mourning his loss.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing sincere and deep regret at learning of the sudden passing of Robert J. Watt. I, like many other Senators here, have known Mr. Watt for many years. We all have had a very high respect and admiration for him because of his high integrity and well-known ability in representing the cause of organized labor, which he has served in this country with such signal success for many years. He was a man of great honor, a man of intense sincerity and integrity, and I feel that I have lost a sincere friend, and that labor has lost one of its ablest advocates in this country.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING FOR VETERANS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. May I renew the request?

The PRESIIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to limit debate on the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit House bill 2181 to 15 minutes for each side? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure that I can dispose of our side of this controversy in 15 minutes.

The first point I wish to make is that I am satisfied that if Members of the Senate will pause long enough to consider the merits of this particular bill they will oppose and vote against the motion of the Senator from Ohio. I shall vote against it because I know that the great majority of Members of the Senate do not want to follow a course of action in the Senate which discriminates unfairly and undeservedly against farm veterans. That is exactly what we are asked to do. It is the basic issue in this debate. I do not intend to let anyone get away from that issue.

If we do not take action on this matter I am satisfied, as the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] pointed out last night, that when we adjourn General Bradley will go back to the old arrangement under which the farm veterans will receive only part-time pay for on-the-job training.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry that I cannot yield. I have only 15 minues.

Mr. President, we cannot justify discriminating against the farm veterans, because the on-the-job-training program for the farm veterans is exactly as sound in all respects as is the on-the-job training for veterans working in industry, in filling stations, or in any other occupation which permits an on-the-job-training program.

In regard to the position taken by the Senator from Ohio, let me say this—and it is the only other thing I wish to say about his position, because I think it is such an untenable position that nothing further needs to be said than the two points which I make against it:

Everything the Senator from Ohio said last night in regard to the on-the-job-training program for farm veterans really goes to the entire question of whether we are to have an on-the-job-training program at all. If his position is to prevail, then what we ought to be doing is repealing the entire on-the-job-training program for veterans. I do not believe that the Senate is willing to do that.

Irrespective of what abuses developed in the on-the-job-training program prior to the Seventy-ninth Congress, I believe that we put in the necessary checks against those abuses, upon the recommendation and representation of General Bradley, in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress. By the ceilings we imposed at that time we gave to General Bradley the checks which he needed. If Senators will read the testimony which he gave before our subcommittee, they will see that the action which we took in the Seventy-ninth Congress did check the great financial abuses which were developing under the on-the-job-training program for veterans before any ceiling was imposed. So I do not believe that we can justify this afternoon following the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio of discriminating against farm veterans because of his objections to the principle and policy of having an on-the-job-training program for veterans. If we are to have it—and there is no proposal to repeal it—then it ought to apply with equal justice to farm veterans as well as to city veterans.

Let me direct attention to some of the statements made by my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I may say to him that, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, I find myself in the position where my personal view in regard to his amendment is contrary to the action taken by the committee. I shall vote as I did in committee, for his amendment as offered; but as chairman of the subcommittee I must say to the Senator from Massachusetts that we considered his amendment carefully. We listened to farm education representatives from Massachusetts and Illinois. Personally I think they made a good case for themselves. But the committee directed that certain letters be sent out to agricultural educators and the deans of great schools of agriculture. They took the problem up with their faculties.

I do not wish to be held too closely to a statement of the exact number of letters, but my recollection is that we received 10 or 12 letters from the deans of agricultural colleges. The general view of those letters was that it would be unwise to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, because they felt that the effect of that amendment might be the lowering of standards. I do not believe that it would have that effect. Why do I not believe it? I do not believe it because I think the standards should rest with the State approving agency. It is up to the respective States to decide what the standards are to be and their record to date is one of maintaining very high standards.

I have confidence that our respective States will maintain a high standard of instruction, and I think so far as instruction of farm veterans is concerns, many times certain techniques can be better taught on the farm than they can be done in the classroom of some Smith-Hughes High School program. So I am perfectly willing, as an individual Senator, to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. But I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think it would be an unfortunate mistake if, merely because we might not be able to pass his amendment—and I think we can pass his amendment if he will offer it—we were to sacrifice the whole program. I do not agree with the Senator from Massachusetts on one point, namely, that this program has not been worked out very carefully by the agricultural educators. After all, those educators have directed the development of the program.

The provisions in this bill as to the number of hours of instruction were worked out with General Bradley and his associates in the Veterans' Administration, after conferences and consultations with the agricultural educators of the country; and this is the program upon which they agree.

Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry that I cannot yield to the Senator. He will have an opportunity in his own time to comment on my arguments.

What the Senator from Massachusetts is proposing—and let this be clear to the Senate—is that the State authorities be given the opportunity and the right to vary the proportion of the hours of instruction as between classroom instruction and farm instruction. Thus in the proposal for group instruction of 200 hours a year, if the State authorities want to have 150 hours of such instruction on the farm and 50 hours in the classroom, the Massachusetts authorities say that ought to be within their discretion. As an individual Senator, I agree. However, the subcommittee disagreed. I am confident that Massachusetts, Wyoming, California or any other State, charged with the responsibility of carrying out the objectives of this legislation, can be depended upon, through State officials, acting in good faith to carry out the objectives of the program. I am satisfied that if it is found in any particular State by the directors of the program that it would be better to have 150 hours of instruction on the farm rather than in the classroom, both the veteran and the Government will get their money's worth.

I use only one example. Let us take the question of irrigation. Suppose the farm veteran is in a State where irrigation is, after all, the one problem on which he needs instruction more than upon any other. I can well understand

that the best place to give him such instruction, after he receives certain classroom instruction in farm engineering, is out on the irrigation projects themselves. He should be given demonstrations in how to install the tiling——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry that I cannot yield because of the limitation of time.

Mr. THYE. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. MORSE. I am trying to cover the case for this bill in 15 minutes. The Senator will have an opportunity to question me in his own time.

I think that decision should be left to the discretion of the State officials. That is why I am willing to support the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. After listening to the representatives of Massachusetts and Illinois, I am still perfectly satisfied that if this bill should be passed without the Senator's amendment, those officials would make the necessary adjustments so as not to sacrifice this program.

What is the alternative? The alternative is that the veterans would have to to go back on a part-time or partial-payment basis. They would not get their full $65 if single, or $90 if they are married. They would get what the Veterans' Administration would give them under the partial-payment plan which was issued, to which the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] objected last summer.

In closing this comment—and I shall use the rest of my time to answer questions—let me say that this is a program which has been thoroughly studied. It is a program which is necessary to do justice to the veterans. It is a program which gives to the veterans approved instruction which has been very carefully arranged by the agricultural extension experts. I think we would be most unfair to the farm veterans of the country if we were to follow the course of action proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] this afternoon.

This proposal came out of our committee by a vote of 10 to 3, in a 13-man committee. As chairman of the subcommittee, I make this plea this afternoon because I conducted the hearings. The hearings are printed. They were carefully and conscientiously conducted, as every member of the full committee has admitted to me when we discussed the question in the committee. In view of the record which we have made, as chairman of the subcommittee, I feel that the majority of the committee ought to be supported, rather than the minority of three on the committee who refused to go along with our report.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wanted to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon one question. We have been speaking about the farm boys who gave up their education under the GI bill of rights to take courses in farming. How can a farm boy in the West or South today go to an educational institution? They are already overcrowded, as the distinguished Senator knows.

Mr. MORSE. They do not want to; they want this farm training under a program which has been worked out on a very education-standard basis. If one will turn to page 8 of the report he will see where the number of hours came from, how the Director of the Veterans' Administration came to select the hours. They are the hours used in the administration of Public Law No. 16, dealing with veterans who come under our rehabilitation program.

This is not a fly-by-night program. It is not a hastily devised program. It has been designed by the best minds of the country dealing in the field of agricultural education. I am at a complete loss to understand how in the closing hours of the session, when the House has already passed the legislation, thought should be given to the proposal of the Senator from Ohio to postpone action, knowing very well that a motion to recommit, even under instructions, will mean, to all intents and purposes, the killing of this program. It is not fair; it is not right. The 10 men who voted for it in the committee ought to be supported this afternoon by voting down the motion offered by the senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As the Senator has so aptly stated, when the States do not have adequate educational facilities in may instances farm boys are taking training on the farm at less cost to the Government.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. THYE. I wish to ask the Senator if it is his opinion that if the on-the-job trainees should not have classroom work they would be deprived of a certain benefit which they get only in the classroom with other on-the-job trainees under a capable instructor, such as studying feed formulas, accounting, and problems pertaining to farming which they could well take in a group in a classroom?

Mr. MORSE. I will say to my friend from Minnesota that I do not take the position that the boy should not have that sort of instruction. I take the position that we ought to have confidence in our State approving agencies and let them determine whether the boys should have class-room instruction or should not have class-room instruction. The sensible way to work it out would be to give the discretion to the State agencies, so that as to certain types of training they can do it in a classroom if they can best teach it that way, but on the farm if they can best teach it on the farm. I used the irrigation example to illustrate my point.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield for another comment in relation to the on-the-job training program, so far as it relates to agriculture, I know of a good many communities in which young men are taking on-the-job training. They go to the high schools and have agricultural classes 2 hours once a week and go over all of that which relates to accounting, feed programs, all types of herd management and cow testing.

Mr. MORSE. It is a technical short course in agriculture?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. It is excellent.

Mr. THYE. Yes. The instructors go out on the farms a certain number of hours a week and proceed to work with the young men on the farms in solving the problems which may confront them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator from Massachusetts like some time?

I shall be glad to yield up to 5 minutes of my time.

Mr. LODGE. I should like, first of all, to compliment the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the way in which he conducted hearings on this subject. I have heard from many people who were present at the hearings glowing accounts of his fairness and of the intelligent and thorough way in which he studied this subject. Let me say this, however, to the Senate, and particularly to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], that even if the amendment which I offered is adopted it will not in any way lessen or interfere with the training of the young man who wants to have 200 hours of instruction which is provided for in the bill. My amendment simply makes it possible for young men in States like Massachusetts, Illinois, Wisconsin, and others, who have gone ahead and worked with the Veterans' Administration on an on-the-job basis, instead of on a classroom basis, to continue to do it that way if they want to. Let me also say that if the bill does not pass at this session, if the motion of the Senator from Ohio is successful, the program will continue in Massachusetts, Illinois, Wisconsin, and, I think, Montana and other States, because those are the States which have already gone ahead and worked something out with the local Veterans' Administration offices.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. They will continue; but the Senator is overlooking the fact that in all probability they will not continue at the $65 to $90 subsistence rate. That is what is so unfair to the students in Massachusetts or any other State if we do not pass this bill. I hope we will pass it with the Senator's amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I think a bill could be worked out which would recognize local differences. I cannot help but feel that there is an intelligent way to make allowance for these schemes which have already been put into effect as a result of local gumption and local initiative. It is not necessary to try to standardize the whole thing. Let me say that I have been in communication with the people in Massachusetts who are most interested in this program. It is their hope that this bill can be reworded so as to accomplish the recognizing of local differences. In the meantime, until that is done, the

present program will continue until January.

Therefore, in view of the attitude of most people, I shall vote to recommit this bill. If that is not successful, then I shall move my amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not want to repeat the argument which I made yesterday, but it seems to me that the additional arguments presented by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] indicate in what complete confusion is this whole matter of on-the-job training including on-farm training. My motion is to recommit it to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions to make a thorough study of all on-the-job training. I think there ought to be on-the-job training, and I think there ought to be on-farm training, but the way it has been organized and on the one hand, with the very loose requirements of the Veterans' Administration and, on the other hand, the rather complicated provisions of this particular bill, it seems to me that we are in danger of enlarging this part of on-the-job training to an indefinite size. The number of veterans participating in the program has been steadily increasing. On September 30, 1946, there were 54,000 trainees; on January 31, 1947, there were 98,000; on March 31, 1947, there were 130,000. It is estimated by the Veterans' Administration that if it is continued in its present way, practically every veteran who is on the farm will take advantage of the course largely for the purpose of drawing the subsistence allowance. We face the serious danger of extending it until it replaces the WPA idea, until every veteran gets the idea that, regardless of instruction, which is merely incidental, merely a side issue, he is entitled to $65 a month simply because he is a veteran.

We encountered the same situation in connection with the general on-the-job training. I propose to make the same motion in regard to the other bill, which provides an increase in the ceiling for on-the-job training, and therefore provides an additional incentive to veterans to participate in on-the-job training, on strictly educational grounds, of course. There are a limited number of persons who can give full time; but if this program continues, every one of the 15,000,000 veterans will be in some kind of on-the-job or on-the-farm training. Before that point is reached, I think a thorough study should be made, and accordingly I think we should recommit the bills, for the purpose of having the study made.

Anyone who reads the letter of General Bradley of June 4, which is addressed to me and which is printed in the committee report, will find that it is, in effect, a minority adverse report. He does not like the idea of expanding on-the-farm training.

Finally, on June 6, I received from General Bradley a letter saying:

> The Veterans' Administration has been advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the proposed legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. President, if these two bills go to the President, I think he will veto them. It seems to me that we should now give more consideration to the subject than we have given to it thus far. This bill was passed in the House of Representatives during the call of the Consent Calendar. Practically no one paid any attention to it there. I have talked to Members of the House of Representatives, and most of them did not even know that the House passed such a bill. No adequate consideration was given to it there.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio that House bill 2181 be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Baldwin	Hill	Murray
Ball	Hoey	Myers
Barkley	Holland	O'Conor
Brewster	Ives	O'Daniel
Bricker	Jenner	Pepper
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Cain	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Capper	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cooper	Langer	Smith
Cordon	Lodge	Sparkman
Donnell	Lucas	Stewart
Dworshak	McCarthy	Taft
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McGrath	Thye
Ferguson	McKellar	Umstead
Flanders	McMahon	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wherry
George	Malone	White
Green	Martin	Williams
Gurney	Maybank	Young
Hatch	Millikin	
Hawkes	Moore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit House bill 2181, Calendar No. 610, with instructions.

Mr. MORSE and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Chair restate the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit House bill 2181 to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions to make a complete study of on-the-job and on-the-farm training.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official committee business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—31

Baldwin	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Brewster	Jenner	Smith
Bricker	Kem	Taft
Brooks	Lodge	Thye
Cain	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Capper	Malone	White
Dworshak	Martin	Williams
Ecton	Millikin	Young
Ferguson	Moore	
Gurney	Reed	

NAYS—45

Aiken	Hoey	Maybank
Barkley	Holland	Morse
Butler	Ives	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Cordon	Kilgore	O'Daniel
Donnell	Knowland	Pepper
Eastland	Langer	Robertson, Va.
Ellender	Lucas	Russell
Flanders	McClellan	Sparkman
Fulbright	McFarland	Stewart
George	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	McMahon	Umstead
Hill	Magnuson	Wherry

NOT VOTING—19

Bridges	Hayden	Tydings
Buck	McCarran	Wagner
Bushfield	O'Mahoney	Watkins
Byrd	Overton	Wiley
Capehart	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson
Chavez	Taylor	
Downey	Tobey	

So Mr. TAFT's motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it be stated. Then I shall move its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks at the end of line 5 and to insert:

Where it has been found that a variation in the proportion of hours of group instruction and individual instruction on the farm will better serve the conditions in a certain area, any program acceptable to the State approving agency which meets the total number of training hours called for in this act (including assembled instruction, individual instruction, and assigned and supervised related home study and supervision in operational skills by the farmer trainer under the direction of the institution) shall be recognized as complying with the requirements of this act;

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who may not have been present within the past hour or so, I should like briefly to state the purpose of the amendment.

As the bill now stands it discriminates against on-the-farm-training programs which have been developed in Massachusetts, Illinois, Wisconsin, and I believe in Montana, and perhaps in some other States, in that it gives no credit for the time which a young man spends while employed on a farm. In other words, the on-the-farm training which certainly is a valuable training, is not given any credit under the bill as it now stands, and it is obligatory for the young man to take 200 hours of college work. The amendment makes it possible for the States I have enumerated, that have worked out these programs with the Veterans' Administration and have made their contracts on this basis, to see them through to the end of the year and to continue these useful and beneficial programs. I am very happy to say that the Senator from Oregon, who was chairman of the subcommittee, gave this matter a very careful hearing and study, and he has been good enough to assure me of his willingness to accept this amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I would say that in my opinion the amendment can be worked out. I have no objection to it.

I hope that it will be approved by the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that as chairman of the subcommittee I must make the report for the committee that the amendment was voted down in committee. I personally was in favor of the amendment. I am personally in favor of the amendment now. I am satisfied that any fears of the Lodge amendment will not materialize into any detriment to this program, and I am satisfied personally that the Lodge amendment will perhaps improve the program in a good many States that are now following the Massachusetts-Illinois pattern. But we did go into it, and it would be most unfair and unethical of me as chairman of the subcommittee not to make it perfectly clear that the committee itself rejected the Lodge amendment. However, I want to state to Senators that if they will go into the record of the testimony and into the record they will find that the Massachusetts and the Illinois plans are of very high order. I am satisfied that the program provided in the bill will not be jeopardized by the Lodge amendment. I, personally, not as chairman of the subcommittee, but in my own individual right as a Member of the Senate, will vote for the Lodge amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is one slight committee amendment that needs to be offered. It was adopted by the committee, but there was a mistake made when the matter was typed, and it did not get into the final bill. It reads:

On page 5, add a new paragraph at the end of section 4, to read as follows:

"The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to contract with approved institutions for such courses where the Administrator finds that the agreed cost is reasonable and fair."

Of course, it is the same provision that is in the program for on-the-job training in commercial establishments. All we did when we adopted the amendment in committee was to make the provision the same for on-the-farm training as for industrial training. I can assure the Senate it was approved by the committee and the only reason it is not in the bill is because of the clerical error in copying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, lines 16 and 17, strike out "Administrator which, when taken as a full-time course" and insert "Administrator. Such course shall be considered a full-time course when it."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 25, after the word "found", insert "by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or the State approving agency."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, at the end of section 4, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, to read as follows:

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to contract with approved institutions for such courses where the Administrator finds that the agreed cost is reasonable and fair.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INCREASED ALLOWANCE AND COMPENSATION FOR ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 431, Senate 1393.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the bill before the Senate be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be allotted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and 15 minutes by myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee considering Senate bill 1393, known as the ceiling bill for the on-the-job training program, I have just two or three points I want to make.

I think I can take less than 15 minutes, which I am sure will be a pleasant surprise to my colleagues.

The bill comes to us out of committee with a full committee vote of 11 to 2, so that 11 members of the committee on Labor and Public Welfare recommend the passage of the bill. What it proposes to do is to increase the ceilings for the on-the-job training program from $175 for single veterans to $200 for single veterans, and from $200 for married veterans to $250 for married veterans. That is the proposal so far as the money increases in the ceilings are concerned.

The second point I want to make, Mr. President—and it is one that I find, in private conversations, so many of my colleagues are not aware of—that the bill does not increase the subsistence allowance itself one dollar. It remains for single veterans $65, and for married veterans $90. No change is made, I may say again, Mr. President, in the subsistence allowance itself.

The third point I want to make is another point that some of my colleagues do not understand, so far as the operation of the bill is concerned. Let us assume now, for the sake of argument, that the bill is passed, and that the $200 for single veterans becomes the wage ceiling. What that means, Mr. President, is that under my bill the veteran only receives money from the Government under the subsistence allowance if the subsistence allowance of $65 for a single veteran and the wage paid him by the employer do not exceed $200. For example, if the employer should pay the veteran worker $190 for wages, then under my bill the veteran would receive only $10 from the Government out of the subsistence allowance. In other words, the subsistence allowance is always cut down if the wage paid by the employer, plus the subsistence, exceed the ceiling.

The original ceiling of $175 for single veterans and $200 for married veterans was hastily passed in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and every man who was in that Congress I think will admit it. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is on the floor. He and

the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] also, and I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], will recall that in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress I had pending before the Senate a bill which sought to eliminate the age requirement as far as the GI educational benefits were concerned. The Senators will recall that the bill, prior to my amendment, limited the age to 25 years for a veteran who sought the educational benefits under the GI bill of rights. I submitted an amendment to the GI bill removing that age restriction so that any veteran, irrespective of age, should have the educational benefits of the bill.

I think it was about the second day before adjournment—and I remember it as though it happened today—the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and, I believe also the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and two or three other Senators, I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] also, took me out into the Democratic conference room and said, "Now look here, we want to help you get your bill through, but protests have been made by the Veterans' Administration as to certain abuses that have developed under the on-the-job training program, because we find that there are applicants for training for the vice presidency of some banks receiving as much as $500 or $600 or $700 a month from the bank itself and collecting also their $65 subsistence allowance"—because at that time there was no ceiling. I went into conference on the matter, and they said "We will help you get your bill through if you will accept an on-the-job training wage ceiling as a rider to your bill". They frankly so stated on the floor their reason for the wage-ceiling rider when we subsequently came to debate the bill. So we agreed in the closing hours of the Seventy-ninth Congress to accept the recommendation of General Bradley himself for a ceiling of $175 for single veterans and $200 for married veterans.

We have tried it since that time, and it has been found to be, as I think the hearings had before my committee show conclusively, to be a ceiling that is too low. There were a great many recommendations made to the committee for increases in the ceiling. The American Legion, through their legislative representative, came before us and made very clear that it was the position of the American Legion that all ceilings should be removed, and we should go back to the position in which we found ourselves before the ceiling rider in the Seventy-ninth Congress was adopted. We as a committee took the position that we could not adopt the position of the American Legion, because we were satisfied from General Bradley's testimony given to us again this year, that it would lead to abuses in the on-the-job-training program.

Then there were other proposals before the committee, as the record will show, for higher ceilings. I think one bill provided $350 a month for married veterans, and I think the bill introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] provided for $300 a month. At least the amount was considerably in excess of what we came out with by way of a compromise. We have come out with this compromise proposal which I think is a very fair, just, and deserved compromise, of $200 for single veterans and $250 for married veterans.

Mr. President, I want to say, and I am sure my colleagues on the subcommittee who voted with me and my colleagues on the full committee, 11 of us altogether, will also assure the Senate, that we have retained a ceiling which will prevent the abuses which developed under the old system, but at the same time will do justice to veterans.

There has been a change in cost of living since the action was taken before, and we think that more veterans ought to be brought into the program, and more will be brought into the program under our bill.

Mr. President, all I can say is that if we are going to keep this program at all, and I think we should, we ought to make this equitable adjustment in the on-the-job training program, especially in view of the fact that we are not changing the subsistence allowance itself.

As to General Bradley's position in this matter, Mr. President, may I say this: The Senator from Ohio is correct in regard to the bill we just passed, because I think the order which General Bradley issued last summer showed that he was against what we subsequently adopted today for farm veterans. But as to the present bill, General Bradley does not testify either for or against it, because he very rightly takes the position that it is a matter of policy to be determined by the Congress.

In closing I want to express myself on this veterans' legislation these words: I have worked hard and fought hard to get my veteran legislation before the Senate. The hour is late in the present session of Congress. Here we have a bill which I think we should pass and get it on its way to the House. It is going to require some House action. I deeply regret, Mr. President, that some of our Republican leaders on the House side are not prone to pass any veterans' legislation of this type at the present session of Congress, because they take the position in their statements to me, and not only that, but they apparently took the position this afternoon in their statements to some veterans' organizations, that they are not inclined to bring this matter up for a vote in the present session of Congress, because the President himself in his state of the Union message expressed himself as being against any further veterans' benefits in the present session of Congress.

Let me say, Mr. President, that on this particular bill we have a letter from the Veterans' Administration which I do not think is subject to the interpretation which some of the leaders in the House on veterans' legislation are giving. I read only the last paragraph, but shall ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD. I read:

> The Veterans' Administration has been advised by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, that there is no objection to the presentation of such report to the committee and that this bill could not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter in full be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 18, 1947.

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAFT: Reference is made to the report furnished to you under date of June 10, 1947, which was an estimate of cost on S. 1393, Eightieth Congress, "A bill to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended."

The Veterans' Administration has been advised by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, that there is no objection to the presentation of such report to the committee and that this bill could not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army,
Administrator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say to my friends of the Republican Party on the House side that I am willing to draw the issue on veterans' legislation by having the Republican majority in both Houses of Congress do what I think they ought to do, namely, pass this deserved legislation for veterans and then put it on the doorstep of the White House, and let us see whether or not the President will sign it. I happen to be one who believes that the merits of the legislation are so sound that given an opportunity to sign it, the President would sign it irrespective of any statement he made in his State of the Union message. Be that as it may, I do not think it is for the Republican leadership in the Senate or in the House to determine what the President's policy ought to be in regard to this legislation or to follow what they think the President's views may be.

We ought to determine, as the Republican majority, whether or not we are willing to do justice to the veterans in this session of the Congress. I submit that this bill, along with the other legislation I have heretofore submitted, and which has been passed, is deserved legislation, decidedly in the interest of the veterans and of the public welfare.

I close by saying that I do not want to see my party, either in the Senate or in the House, sell the veterans short by not passing this deserved legislation when we have the opportunity to pass it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield if I have any more time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has four more minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I finished in less than 15 minutes. It is pretty good for me to close the session that way.

I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. If my memory serves me correctly, the Senator has accurately stated what took place during the closing days of the last session of Congress. We found ourselves in a very tight and difficult situation due to the fact that the Congress was about ready to close, and we were trying to do the very best we could for our veterans under the circumstances.

I also wish to say that the Senator is exactly right when he says that the evidence before our subcommittee shows definitely that the present ceilings are too low, and that those ceilings should be raised. I want to join with the Senator in the very eloquent plea he has made here this afternoon in urging the Senate to raise the ceilings.

I might add, if there is a minute left, that no one could be more devoted or more indefatigable in his efforts in behalf of the veterans of the country than is the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the approach suggested, at least, in the speech of the Senator from Oregon, that the two parties ought to compete for veterans' favors, I think is a very dangerous policy to suggest. I think that was his final appeal. My judgment is that action ought to depend on the merits of the particular proposal, and what it involves and means.

This bill would increase the cost to the Government of the United States of veterans' allowances by approximately $85,000,000. It is contrary to the program of the President. General Bradley's letter of July 18, only a week ago, states that the Veterans' Administration has been advised that the bill could not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President.

As I have stated several times, I believe that the on-the-job training program presents the greatest danger that we face today in building up a perfectly tremendous veterans' expense, already amounting to $7,000,000,000 a year and capable of almost indefinite expansion.

We have also a long report from the Director of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, which clearly disapproves the bill. This report discusses the fact that the whole on-the-job idea was inserted into the original GI bill without much thought. There was virtually no discussion of the few words which were inserted in the original bill which authorized it.

There was widespread surprise and concern when this little-understood provision of law was utilized rapidly a year ago to enable hundreds of thousands of fully employed veterans to obtain subsistence allowances of $65 or $90 a month while their employers provided them with on-the-job training in a variety of occupations, many of which were far removed from the skilled occupations to which apprenticeship applies. No one can question the importance of apprenticeship courses.

For example, there were courses for soda-fountain managers, stock clerks, all types of salesmen, gasoline-station attendants, and managers, farm laborers, and so on. Many of these occupations were those in which the cost of training had always previously been absorbed by the employer as a part of the normal cost of doing business.

To a large extent these payments are not particularly for the benefit of the employee. They relieve the employer from paying the employee what he probably would otherwise pay him anyway.

As soon as people caught on to this so-to-speak easy method of drawing allowances the number of on-the-job trainees jumped from 25,000 in January 1946 to 400,000 at the end of July, with still a large backlog of veterans who had made application but who had not yet been put on the rolls to get their subsistence allowances. There appeared to be no limit to the number of veterans who could be trained on the job, short of the limit of 10,000,000 veterans in full-time employment. To provide subsistence allowances to all of them would vastly increase the Federal budget.

When it comes to college, boys usually go for 2 years, 3 years, or 4 years, and then they are through. A certain number of individuals want that kind of training. In the on-the-job training program, any one of 15,000,000 veterans can choose a new occupation at any time for the next 10 years. He can go into that training course, whatever it is, and proceed to draw allowances until his pay reaches a figure of more than $3,000 a year. There is a ceiling on what they get from the employer, plus what the Government gives them. If they are earning as much as $2,100 a year today, in the case of a single man, then they do not receive anything. But a veteran receives enough to bring his income up to $2,100 in the case of a single man, and $2,400 in the case of a married man. The bill proposes to increase the allowances so that the single man will receive an allowance up to $2,400, and the married man up to $3,000.

The average monthly earnings of all manufacturing production workers in November 1946, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, was $198 a month, or approximately $2,400 a year. It is proposed to help those men get $3,000 a year, and to draw taxes from the working men of the country whose average income in manufacturing business—and that is relatively high, compared with other occupations—is only $2,400. We are taxing people who earn $2,400 in order to raise this particular group to $3,000. The average median monthly earnings of all employed veterans in June 1946 was approximately the same, about $2,400 a year; and we are taxing all the other veterans who earn that amount of money in order to pay veterans who earn less, and bring them up to $2,400. Of course, there is an educational feature; but my belief is that the whole question should be reexamined.

The Veterans' Administration apparently has felt—I think mistakenly—that it had to take practically any course suggested by any State, and say, "Here is on-the-job training." If a man wants to train to be a bank president, as long as he is a bank clerk he draws enough to bring his income up to $2,400, under this bill, if he is single, or $3,000 if he is married. The higher we go the greater the incentive for more veterans to take advantage of what seems to me, on the whole to be very easy money. They receive instruction. In most cases they would receive just about the same instruction if there were no payment. The employer is not paid for giving the instruction. There is no tuition. Yet these men are permitted to draw this money for receiving instruction which employers have always given free, and which they will give free today if we do not continue these on-the-job training allowances. I think there are legitimate cases, but I feel that the subject ought to be strictly examined, and that the bill should therefore be recommitted to the committee to consider the problem before we make the program still more attractive, and before we put $35,000,000 more into it—before we invite 15,000,000 veterans to find on-the-job training in some business by which they can take advantage of these payments.

Unfortunately, the attitude of a few groups is that this is becoming a payment to which every veteran is entitled as a matter of fact, because he is a veteran, and not because he is learning anything. When we reach that point it means, in effect, that the allowances will be paid to all 15,000,000 veterans; and if we do that, the cost will run up to $15,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000 for veterans alone

I therefore move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions to make a thorough study of all on-the-job training.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit the bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator has enumerated many abuses which apparently have developed under the on-the-job training program. Is it not a fact that if those abuses exist, they are largely the result of the administration of the program by the Veterans' Administration, and should they not be corrected by General Bradley and his assistants?

Mr. TAFT. I am not capable of saying whether that is the fact. It seems to me that the Veterans' Administration has been in general very lax in accepting these courses. Their position is that under the terms of the GI bill of rights, if a State approves a certain course they are practically bound to accept it. If that be true, the law should be changed. That is what I want the committee to study. I think General Bradley has washed his hands a little too much. He has said, "I do not approve of it, but I cannot do anything about it." I think there is possibly some basis of criticism, although I do not like to make the charge myself without knowing any more about it than I do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Holland	Pepper
Bricker	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to recommit to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions, Senate bill 1393.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business. If present and voting the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—20

Ball	Ferguson	Reed
Brewster	Gurney	Taft
Bricker	Hawkes	Vandenberg
Butler	Hickenlooper	White
Byrd	Kem	Wiley
Cain	Millikin	Williams
Capper	Moore	

NAYS—57

Aiken	Holland	Murray
Baldwin	Ives	Myers
Barkley	Jenner	O'Conor
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chavez	Kilgore	Revercomb
Connally	Knowland	Robertson, Va.
Cooper	Langer	Russell
Cordon	Lodge	Saltonstall
Donnell	Lucas	Smith
Dworshak	McClellan	Sparkman
Eastland	McFarland	Stewart
Ecton	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McMahon	Thye
Fulbright	Magnuson	Tydings
George	Malone	Umstead
Green	Martin	Watkins
Hatch	Maybank	Wherry
Hill	Morse	Young

NOT VOTING—18

Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	McCarran	Taylor
Capehart	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McKellar	Tobey
Flanders	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Hayden	Overton	Wilson

So the motion to recommit with instructions was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1393) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That in no event shall the rate of such allowance plus the compensation received exceed $200 per month for a veteran without a dependent or $250 per month if he has a dependent or dependents."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to express to the Senator from Ohio my sincere and deep appreciation for the cooperation he has extended to me in regard to the veterans' legislation. He and I have been trying to get this legislation before the Senate for days. I want the Senator from Ohio to know that, although we differ on the merits of the legislation, I appreciate his cooperation in helping me to get it before the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

MORTGAGE INSURANCE UNDER NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Ohio in regard to Senate bill 1720, Calendar No. 762, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended. The bill was unanimously reported from the Banking and Currency Committee by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. Does the Senator from Ohio believe we can reach that bill tonight?

Mr. TAFT. I suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that when we reach the call of the calendar, he request unanimous consent to revert to that bill, if we fail to have it passed during the call of the calendar. Then we can see what we can do with it.

We have the sugar bill and one other bill before we begin to consider the calendar at the point where we ended the call of the calendar yesterday. But during the call of the calendar, the Senator from South Carolina may request unanimous consent to return to a previous bill, of course.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senator, except to mention the fact, which he knows, that in providing for the continuation of the RFC, we left out certain refinancing provisions. Unless this bill is passed and sent to the House of Representatives, the Federal Housing Administration will be left without funds after October.

Mr. TAFT. I understand.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall appreciate the efforts of the Senator from Ohio to have the bill considered.

Mr. TAFT. I understand, and I shall do my best.

MEETINGS OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before yielding the floor, I wish to make an announcement on behalf of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The second supplemental deficiency bill will be marked up at 7 o'clock p. m.

The full committee will meet at 8 p. m. to consider the mark-up by the subcommittee of the second supplemental deficiency bill.

The conference committee on the appropriations for civil functions of the War Department will meet at 7:30 p. m.

The conference committee on the first supplemental appropriation bill will meet at 8:30 p. m.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I am a member of these appropriations committees, I shall appreciate it if the Senator from Ohio can give me some indication of when he thinks we shall have an executive session.

Mr. TAFT. I doubt that we shall have an executive session tonight. The present plan is to deal with the sugar bill. I do not know how long the consideration of that bill will take. I hope it will not take too long.

Then we shall have the resolution of the Senator from West Virginia, relating to an investigation of immigration, with the understanding that if that takes an hour and still is not disposed of, we shall lay it aside, and shall take up the calendar, returning to that bill after the calendar is disposed of.

That is the general plan.

Mr. TYDINGS. What would be the program?

Mr. TAFT. After last night's session, I would hope that we might be able to take a recess by 10 or 11 o'clock this evening, and have one last call of the Executive Calendar tomorrow. There is not so much business for tomorrow, and I see no reason why there should not be a full consideration.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, does the Senator feel he can now give me assurance that some time either tonight or tomorrow there will be a call of the Executive Calendar?

Mr. TAFT. I think I can give assurance that that is the intention.

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMANDANT, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, TO GRANT WAIVERS FOR EMPLOYMENT OF CERTAIN ALIEN SEAMEN

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to ask for immediate consideration of a House joint resolution which is in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, not having been reported to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 245, amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I now ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 345) amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4075, Calendar No. 608, the so-called sugar bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that the Senate proceed to consider House 4075.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4075) to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the present Sugar Act expires December 31, 1947. Those of us who are especially interested because of the activities in our States in the growing or processing of the beets or the cane, have been anxious as to the further course of covering legislation.

For a time it appeared that a simple extension would be the most that could be hoped for, this because of the apparent inability of the interested parties to get together. Those of us in the Congress especially interested counseled the representatives of the producers and processors that more than a simple, short extension could not be had unless a wide area of agreement could be achieved. In reaching agreement among the numerous interests involved, there had to be reconciliation of many points of conflict. The mainland cane- and beet-sugar producers and processors were not in agreement.

There was appearance of some division of opinion between the agencies of the Government which are interested. Secretary of Agriculture Anderson took an active interest in helping to put this bill together.

The accords which were reached came somewhat as a surprise to many of us. There was not a single interest that received everything it wanted. Every interest had to sacrifice a part of its ambition. I believe those sacrifices were made because it was apparent that a simple extension statute would not give the stability to the industry which is required in this transitional period.

Secretary Anderson, appearing before the House Ways and Means Committee on June 21, 1947, well expressed the official viewpoint toward the bill. He said:

> With that in mind it was suggested that we confer with the Department of the Interior because it has a responsibility to Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

He is referring to efforts to get together.

> The Department of the Interior looked at the bill carefully. The Secretary of the Interior phoned me after he had had an opportunity to study it, to say he was in full agreement with the purpose of the bill, and they would be able to support it, because they felt it was of great value that the domestic areas were in agreement on it. I then suggested they consult the Bureau of the Budget and the State Department and other branches of the administration, and I am now in a position to say to you I am confident that the administration will be pleased to support a bill such as has been drawn if it should be favorably acted upon by this committee and by the House in turn, and finally by the Senate.

The bill before us represents the result of all those negotiations, adjustments, and conciliations.

The bill in substance is a 5-year extension, with changes, some of the more important of which will be specially mentioned, of the sugar-control legislation which has been in effect in this country since 1934.

Included in the features of that existing control system are these. A quota system dividing the sugar needs of the Nation among those who historically have supplied them. Our sugar needs from year to year are estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture. Benefit payments are provided for our producers. These are contingent on not employing child labor, paying labor bills, and on observing requirements as to the amount of sugar to be produced.

An excise tax is levied on the processor, which in theory is supposed to equal the benefit payments, but which in practice has exceeded the amount of those payments. It must be thoroughly understood that this is a temporary measure, that every Senator voting for the bill reserves unimpaired his own philosophy and freedom as to permanent sugar legislation and as to other agricultural policies.

Let us look at some of the new features of the bill before us. Section 201 would modify the method of estimating the quantity of sugar needed to meet the requirements of consumers in the continental United States. Under the Sugar Act of 1937 the estimate is made on a consumption basis in an amount not less than the average per capita consumption during the 2-year period 1937–38, which amounts to 102.6 pounds.

That per capita standard is omitted, and there is a provision directing the Secretary in making consumption estimates to take into consideration certain standards with a view of providing a supply of sugar which will be consumed at prices which will not be excessive to consumers and which will fairly and equitably maintain and protect the welfare of the domestic sugar industry.

The standards to be taken into consideration include the level of consumption during the preceding year, any deficiency or surplus in sugar inventories, changes in population and demand conditions, level and trend of consumer purchasing power, and the relationship between the prices at wholesale for refined sugar and the general cost of living in the United States, as compared with the relationship between the prices at wholesale for refined sugar and the general cost of living in the United States during 1947, prior to the time when controls on sugar were brought to an end.

The Secretary does not have to give any special weighting to any of those factors, but he must consider all of them and reach his decision. The over-all controlling guide is the provision which requires the establishment of a supply of sugar which will be consumed at prices which will not be excessive to consumers, and which will fairly and equitably maintain and protect the welfare of the domestic sugar industry.

There are also new provisions for the establishment of the quotas.

Under the act of 1937 the quotas for sugar-producing areas, both domestic and foreign, are based upon percentages of the estimate of consumption requirements, so that annual quotas vary depending upon the amount of such estimates.

Section 202 of the bill establishes fixed quotas for the domestic-producing areas totaling 4,268,000 short tons, raw value. An additional 952,000 short tons are allocated to the Philippines under the Philippine Trade Act of 1946. The difference between the fixed amount for the domestic-producing areas and the Republic of the Philippines and the estimate of consumption requirements is apportioned to Cuba and foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines, on the basis of the same percentages ratios as are now provided in the Sugar Act of 1937, namely,

98.64 percent to Cuba and 1.36 percent to full-duty countries.

Let me give an estimate of what the Philippine deficiencies predicted over the next few years: 752,000 tons in 1948, 552,000 tons in 1949, 302,000 tons in 1950, and 202,000 tons in 1951 and 1952.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As the Senator recalls, in the committee there was a discussion with respect to the language of the bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, if the Secretary of State finds that any foreign country denies fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation, or industry, and so notifies the Secretary—that is, the Secretary of Agriculture—to withhold or withdraw any increase in share, and so forth. A considerable number of American nationals have claims against the nationals of Cuba. It may be that some of them have claims against some public authority in Cuba. They felt that instead of simply giving authority or discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture, in the event the Secretary of State found that our nationals were being treated unfairly, there ought to be a mandatory provision with respect to his authority to press for the collection of claims in behalf of American nationals against people in Cuba. After discussing the matter in the committee it was decided not to offer an amendment of that sort, for obvious reasons which need not be gone into here. But there are numerous claimants in the United States against institutions and individuals in Cuba, who ought to be paid. There is no reason I know of why they should longer be denied settlement of their claims.

Out of deference to the diplomatic situation existing at this time, an amendment was not offered making it mandatory that the Secretary of Agriculture, upon a finding by the Secretary of State, proceed in a way that would seek to enforce payment of those claims. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado, the very able and fair chairman of the committee, what he thinks our attitude ought to be, what his attitude ought to be, and what the attitude of the State and Agriculture Departments ought to be, as well as the attitude of the Cuban interests with respect to the payment of these just and honorable claims which our nationals have growing out of the sugar situation?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It seems to me, of course, that Cuba should pay acknowledged and adjudicated claims. There are many claims, I assume, which have neither been acknowledged nor adjudicated. There might be some technical difficulties with respect to adjudicated or acknowledged claims; but certainly a nation which is the beneficiary of the riches which flow to it from what we are granting in this act in the way of entry of Cuban sugar into this country ought to be willing to pay the just debts of American nationals. I see no reason why the subject should not be covered as it is in the bill. I believe it would be a mistake to make action compulsory on the Secretary. I believe that he should have flexibility of discretion, so that he may act justly, so that there would be no reason for proceeding harshly or in an arbitrary manner, and so that he would have leeway for the preservation of friendship and the attainment of justice to our nationals.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the reply of the Senator from Colorado. I should like to ask him whether his interpretation would be made along this line: In the case of the payment of just claims, claims which have been adjudicated or adjusted by any process by the Cuban people or the Cuban Government, or whatever agency may have incurred the indebtedness, if there were a deliberate refusal to pay such just and honorable claims, would not that be regarded as a denial of fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, under the language of the bill?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that if the denial were arbitrary, with the intention of defeating a just debt, it would be proper ground for invoking the provisions of that paragraph.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's reply. Of course, we all sympathize with Cuba. We admire Cuba. We admire her people. We have had an intimate association with them for half a century, growing out of the Spanish-American War. None of us wants to do an injustice to the Cuban people or the Cuban Government or become arbitrary ourselves in dealing with them. Yet at the same time I think no one can deny our right to be interested in a reciprocal performance of the mutual obligations which exist between the two countries and their nationals.

In that accommodative situation and in that atmosphere, I have, myself, although requested by constituents of mine, declined to offer an amendment making it compulsory, on the ground and in the hope that it could be worked out amicably so that claims of our people would be adjusted and paid without a rigid requirement that the Secretary of Agriculture, under any finding of the Secretary of State, would be compelled to proceed in a certain way. Does the Senator from Colorado feel that that is a fair and just attitude, not only on account of our own nationals, but because of the situation between our country and Cuba in such matters?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should think that Cuba would not object to seeing that the just claims of our nationals are paid. I am grateful that the Senator has not offered an amendment which would make action compulsory, because, after all, each claim has to be studied. There may be surface indications that lend the appearance of justice to a bad claim. But certainly with such matters in mind, I think that our Secretary of State should use his good offices to see that these claims are paid.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I do not know all the details of the various claims which have been asserted and are being asserted by American nationals. I think it would be most unfortunate if there were any arbitrary refusal on the part of Cuba or her nationals to meet our own people in a spirit of accommodation and in a desire to liquidate these claims, whatever they may be, based upon the merits of the claims individually. I am not speaking of them en masse or en bloc or in groups. It may be that they vary in their merits. It may be that some claims have been longer delayed in their payment. Others may not have been adjudicated to the point where the exact amount may be known. But in any case there should be no effort on the part of our friend and neighbor, and I hope there is none, to delay unnecessarily the liquidation and payment of these claims in behalf of American citizens.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, before we leave this subject I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question. In the committee report, page 4, there is the following paragraph:

> It is the intent of the committee that the nonpayment of valid claims which have been adjudicated or acknowledged by foreign countries shall constitute unfair or inequitable treatment within the meaning of section 202 (e). Representatives of the State Department appearing before the committee concurred in this construction of the language of section 202 (e).

My question is this: The Sugar Act is administered by the Department of Agriculture. Is there a concurrence of opinion between the Department of Agriculture and the State Department in agreement with the paragraph which I have read?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Whether there is a concurrence I cannot say; but the State Department has approved this paragraph and the Department of Agriculture has approved the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There would be only one Department to pass upon what would be done to a defaulting nation, and that would be the State Department?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I wondered about it because the question arose in the House of Representatives. The understanding is complete within the committee, is it not, that the Agricultural Department will accept the judgment of the State Department?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, yes; the Agricultural Department would have nothing to do with the prosecution of those claims or with the diplomatic interchanges necessary to have something done about them.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Massachusetts has several sugar refineries within its boundaries, and I would like to ask the chairman of the Finance Committee if this bill, in his opinion, protects the sugar refineries in the United States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In my opinion, it does.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does it give them all the raw sugar to which they are entitled?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It gives them all to which they are entitled under all the circumstances with which we are dealing. I do not believe that anyone who has joined in shaping this bill is 100-percent satisfied. If anyone were 100-percent satisfied, it would be a bad bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator compare the benefits to Puerto Rico with those to Cuba in connection with the sugar program?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Cuba is the largest sugar producer in the world. Puerto Rico is a smaller sugar producer, but a very important one. Puerto Rico has a fixed quota under this bill, as has Hawaii and as has our domestic cane producers and our domestic beet-sugar producers. Puerto Rico has a definite quota which she can count upon putting into our market. Cuba has a varying quota with a minimum approximately equal to 28.6 percent of the consumption under the measurement requirements of the 1937 Sugar Act.

Mr. LANGER. How much does Puerto Rico furnish?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will give the Senator the exact figures, and I think this is a good place to put them into the RECORD. Does the Senator wish to know the quota, or what they actually supply?

Mr. LANGER. The quota.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Cuban sugar quota is a quota which varies and which is measured by adding together all of the fixed quotas, taking the estimate of consumption of the Secretary of Agriculture, subtracting the two, and giving Cuba 98-and-a-fraction percent of the result.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that Puerto Rico cannot compete with Cuba because of an Executive order issued by a former President—I think is was Mr. Wilson—whereby ships coming back without cargo can bring in sugar at a much less rate than the rate at which it can be shipped by Puerto Rico?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would say that is not correct. Puerto Rico is shipping sugar into this country.

Mr. LANGER. Yes, but that is because there is a shortage of sugar. Where there is overproduction the situation is different.

Mr. MILLIKIN. This bill will meet the precise point to which the Senator is referring, because Puerto Rico will get an absolute fixed quota.

Mr. LANGER. Will it be at a fixed price?

Mr. MILLIKIN. There will be no fixed price.

Mr. LANGER. If there is no fixed price and Cuba gets the benefit of these cargoes of sugar at a less rate than the rate at which Puerto Rico can ship it here, why is not Cuba getting an advantage?

Mr. MILLIKIN. With reference to the price, the Secretary of Agriculture is supposed to make an estimate of consumption on a yearly basis. This estimate, measuring as it does the supply, has a profound effect on price.

Mr. LANGER. I am afraid I did not make myself clear. Suppose there is an overproduction of sugar, and suppose Cuba wishes to sell sugar and Puerto Rico wishes to sell sugar. The American buyer can buy sugar cheaper from Cuba than from Puerto Rico, because of the advantage under the President's executive order; is not that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not say that each country could land its sugar in this country at exactly the same price.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In the sugar bill, has any provision been made relative to the free shipment of Cuban sugar or the shipment of Cuban sugar at a lower price than Puerto Rican sugar, due to the Executive order of a former President?

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is nothing in this bill that bears on that subject.

Mr. LANGER. How will it affect our people out West? In the Red River Valley there are hundreds of thousands of acres of land on which thousands of our farmers wish to produce sugar. Under this bill, will there be a limitation on the acreage, or will there not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We shall have a fixed quota. The fixed quota will give room for expansion. The bill is temporary.

I may say to the Senator that there, again, each interest wishes to have more than it has. Inasmuch as I come from a beet-sugar area, I wish that that area had a larger quota. The cane-sugar people wish they had a larger quota. Everyone wishes to have a larger quota. But I think the quotas of the bill represent the best that can be worked out at this time.

Let me say that this is a 5-year bill. It is temporary legislation. We can look at it again in the future. In the meantime I may say that we are not producing as much sugar as we are allowed by the quota. We have room to grow.

Mr. LANGER. In the Senator's opinion, under this bill what will be the percentage of increase of acreage in the United States, over the acreage in 1938?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I cannot state it in terms of acreage, but I can state what we produced, as compared to what our quota is.

Under the proposed act, the domestic beet-sugar people have a quota of 1,800,000 short tons.

Let me give the Senator some of the history for the production in the last few years in regard to domestic beet sugar.

In 1940, we produced 1,897,000 tons of beet sugar.

In 1941, we produced 1,588,000 tons.

In 1942 we produced 1,726,000 tons.

In 1943 we produced 998,000 tons.

In 1944 we produced 1,056,000 tons.

In 1945 we produced 1,278,000 tons.

In 1946 we produced 1,523,000 tons.

Somewhere here I think I have a later figure. But those figures will give the Senator an idea that our quota under this bill is higher than our production of sugar in most of the recent years, although not higher than what we have produced in some past years.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, there would be no provision in law on this subject, I suppose; but has any investigation been made as to whether the peons of Cuba are going to get a decent wage for the production of sugar?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We are able to impose certain controls as to our domestic sugar, but we have no right to impose controls so far as a foreign country is concerned.

Mr. LANGER. Then the big banking institutions that own this sugar land in Cuba can pay 50 cents a day or $5 a day, so far as this bill is concerned, can they?

Mr. MILLIKIN. This bill does not attempt to regulate wages in Cuba.

Mr. LANGER. So our farmers and producers will be in competition, if we may call it that, with producers in Cuba, without having any provision made for a decent standard of living for the peons of Cuba.

Mr. MILLIKIN. With this exception: If quotas were not provided by this act, and if we had a three-quarter-cent tariff, which is the tariff with Cuba, our farmers would not be producing any sugar. This bill will prevent that from happening.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I apologize to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. He rose before I did.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the bill does not provide and cannot provide for control of wages in Cuba.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That point should be made clear.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But it does provide, in a unilateral way, that this country can tell Cuba when a claim is just and when it is unjust. Subsection (e) of section 202 so provides, does it not? Is not that what it means?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have stated that we have no right to regulate wages in Cuba, and we do not attempt to do so. That is an internal matter affecting the citizens of Cuba.

The paragraph to which the Senator takes exception relates to the claims of American nationals against Cuba.

Mr. LANGER. Very well. Then we do not have the right to tell Cuba what she shall pay in wages, but we do have the right to tell Cuba whether such claims are just, whether such claims should be paid, or whether the claims should be executed without allowing the Government anything to say about it? Is that the interpretation of section 202, subsection (e)?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, that paragraph, under its terms, gives certain discretions to the Secretary of State. I do not believe for one moment that it could properly be assumed that he would

act in an arbitrary manner in reference to such claims. His job is to preserve peace between this country and other countries.

In the colloquy I had with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, I hope I made it very clear that to my mind it will be a mistake to make it mandatory upon the Secretary of State to enforce his opinion in these matters, and that the best we can do is to give him discretion, which, I respectfully suggest, we must assume will be exercised wisely and in the interest of good foreign relations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say a word in that connection, I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that, as I understand the provision, certainly the language of the bill does not give the Secretary of State the power himself to adjudicate any claim. But it merely provides, as the report itself shows, on page 4, that this particular section shall become effective when claims have been adjudicated or acknowledged by foreign countries as being valid.

So the adjudication of the claim is to be handled according to the customary procedure now followed, and is not affected by anything in this bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sorry I cannot agree with that because I interpret subsection (e) in a different way. Who finds whether or not a country has been equitable and just to our citizens? Our Secretary of State. Who puts in the claim? Our Secretary of State.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that the Senator from Wyoming has been right many times, but I do not believe he can be right 100 percent all the time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The legislative intent of this provision is clearly stated in the report and it has now been stated by the Senator in charge of the bill in response to the inquiry of the Senator from New Mexico. The claims which are the subject of this particular section are those claims which are adjudicated and acknowledged by the foreign countries. In other words, there is nothing in the bill which in any way alters or changes or adds to or subtracts from the present method of adjudicating the claims of nationals against a foreign country. But it is provided in the bill merely that when a claim has been so adjudicated and so acknowledged then this provision dealing with the new quota which is being extended to foreign countries may be so administered as to be an effective instrument for collecting an already acknowledged claim.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish I could agree with the Senator from Wyoming as to that interpretation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the legislative history, and what has been said in the report, and what has now been said on the floor of the Senate, would be taken into consideration in any court.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish I could agree with the Senator from Wyoming. I cannot do so, but I do not desire to interrupt the Senator from Colorado in explaining the provisions of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator is going to offer his amendment, I should like to go into it more fully at that time, rather than divert to it now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. A moment ago the Senator was discussing quotas for various domestic producers. Is it not a fact that irrespective of the determination made for our subsequent requirements, all domestic producers shall receive 4,268,000 tons?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And if the determination, let us say, should be 7,500,000 tons, Cuba would get 98.64 percent of the difference between 7,500,000 and the aggregate that is allowed to the domestic producers, which would include continental producers and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, plus the Philippines?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We would have to add the Philippine deficit in that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am assuming in my question that the Philippine Islands will produce their entire production. If there should be a deficit, then under another section of the bill 95 percent of the deficit would go to Cuba?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the remainder to foreign countries?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

I should like to explore briefly a little further the paragraph of the bill to which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico objects.

Section 202 (e) is a new provision under which the Secretary is authorized to withhold or withdraw any increase in the quota for any foreign country over that provided for such country under the Sugar Act of 1937 upon a finding and notification by the Secretary of State that such country denies fair and equitable treatment to nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation, or industry. In the event that any quota, or any portion thereof, is withheld or withdrawn pursuant to this section the amounts so withdrawn are to be allocated proportionately among the domestic producing areas, and if the domestic areas are unable to fulfill such amounts so allotted them the amounts unfilled may be allotted by the Secretary to foreign countries which do not deny fair and equitable treatment to nationals of the United States.

It has been brought to the attention of the committee that there have been instances where nationals of the United States have been unable to collect pecuniary claims from foreign governments notwithstanding the fact that, in many instances, the validity of such claims has been acknowledged by, or adjudicated in the courts of, such foreign countries.

It is the intent of the committee that the nonpayment of valid claims which have been adjudicated or acknowledged by foreign countries shall constitute unfair or inequitable treatment within the meaning of section 202 (e). Representatives of the State Department appearing before the committee concurred in this construction of the language of section 202 (e).

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I refer to the last paragraph of the report:

> Representatives of the State Department appearing before the committee concurred in this construction of the language of section 202 (e).

That is the language of the bill. Did the committee inquire from the same representatives of the State Department whether they approved of the language?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have made inquiries, and the State Department approves.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the committee have any statement in writing from the State Department?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; we had nothing in writing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator think that in a matter of this importance the committee should have something in writing from the State Department? Whom in the State Department did the Senator ask to say that they approved of that particular language?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I made inquiries of the gentlemen who are in the division of the State Department which would be concerned with matters of this kind, and they told me that the State Department approved of that language.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair ask the Senator at that point for his opinion whether similar language appears in some other international documents?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; I shall come to that right now. I had intended reserving it until the Senator brought up his amendment.

There is nothing new whatever about language of this type to protect nationals of the United States from being discriminated against. The Trade Agreements Act under which we make our reciprocal trade agreements contains this language; I am quoting from United States Code, title XIX, section 1351:

> The proclaimed duties and other import restrictions shall apply to imports the growth produce or manufacture of all foreign countries whether imported directly or indirectly; provided that the President may suspend the application to articles the growth produce or manufacture of any country because of its discriminatory treatment of American commerce or because of other acts or policies which in his opinion tend to defeat the purposes set forth in this section.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The only concern I have about this matter is whether it imposes

upon the Cuban Government and people any obligation with respect to nationals of this country which is not a reciprocal obligation upon the Government of this country with respect to the nationals of Cuba. A little while ago I fear we tarnished somewhat our distinguished record for giving independence to the Philippines by assuring privileges for America in the Philippines which, so far as I know, we did not assure the Philippines in respect to the United States.

Mr. President, that is not mutuality; that is not the good-neighbor policy; that is not the policy I believe the people of this country wish to pursue. I wish to be very clear that this is a reciprocal obligation that the same benefits which we confer upon our business people with respect to the right of penetration into Cuba shall redound to the nationals of Cuba who wish to penetrate into the economy of the United States. Less than that is unworthy of a great country, and I am sure the able Senator from Colorado would not knowingly associate himself with it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to say that the language in this bill which we are discussing is associated with a definite privilege which we are extending to Cuba. Whether Cuba makes the same claims with respect to any privilege that she extends to us, I am not in a position to say. I do not think that this pretends to be a complete statute of reciprocity. It is not a reciprocity statute at all. It is a unilateral action, in which unilaterally we confer great benefits on Cuba, and attach what seems to me to be the modest provision that our nationals shall not be discriminated against.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have not examined critically this provision, but I heard something to the effect that the purpose of the amendment is to require certain Cubans to pay some debts to somebody in the United States. I am sure I may have been out of the chamber when the Senator gave the previous explanation. Would the Senator succinctly tell me what the basis of this thing is?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe that there are claims by American nationals against the Cuban Government and agencies of the Cuban Government, which have been adjudicated or acknowledged as just, which have not been paid. That is one category. And now, without mentioning Cuba—in a sense I think it is unfortunate that we single out a particular country for discussion here in this debate—without mentioning Cuba, there are other types of discrimination which injure good international relations. There are shipping restrictions. There are restrictions against work opportunities for our nationals. It is sometimes impossible for American nationals in business in certain foreign countries to send in their own auditors to look into their own businesses, built there with their own capital. This sort of clause is not necessarily related to the single matter of claims. I think it goes to other forms of discrimination.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, are these claims related to the Sugar Act in any way, or are these merely claims that grow out of something disassociated from the sugar quota or the Sugar Act which is now in force?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may say to the Senator that so far as I know they are not directly associated with sugar. They constitute as far as I know a miscellaneous group of claims against Cuba and Cuban agencies, which have been acknowledged as just, or adjudicated, and there are many claims in addition which have not been adjudicated and which have not been acknowledged.

Mr. PEPPER. Is not the effect of this provision that we are now discussing that unless the Cuban Government settles the claims in a way satisfactory to the United States, they cannot take advantage of the quota provisions allowed them under the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It does not go that far. In the first place, the right of the Secretary to withhold the privileges of this act goes only to certain increases that will be above a minimum which Cuba would get in all events. The provision has in contemplation a distinct privilege which we are bestowing upon Cuba, and in connection with that, we are asking that Cuba be just to our nationals.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow this observation, during the war Cuba did a particularly generous thing, a reciprocally advantageous thing to us. We lacked sugar, and Cuba had sugar, and she furnished it to us. Now, we have determined the quota that Cuba may send into this country. But, Mr. President, what seems to me, if I may say so, to be the wrong approach of this provision, is for us in a sugar bill dealing with sugar quotas to lay down conditions which the Cuban Government must meet with respect to certain claims that some of her nationals, or her Government may owe to nationals of the United States.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if there are any unpaid Cuban claims, surely that is a matter of direct negotiation between our Government and the Cuban Government. I have sufficient faith in the good will of the Cuban Government and their known confidence in our good will to believe that our two countries can bring about the adjustment of any differences between them. But for us, here in the Congress, to go outside the executive branch of the Government and to say that the Cuban people cannot enjoy the right to send sugar into the United States unless some Cubans, who may not be sugar growers at all, pay certain claims to somebody in the United States, seems to me to be the wrong approach to this matter, and to impose a condition which I believe it is not in the furtherance of our friendship to impose in this legislation.

If the President or the State Department tell us that they have tried to settle the claims, and the President asks us to put a sort of embargo on Cuban exports into this country until they meet his demands, then I would be willing to consider the President's recommendations; but I am not disposed, without a recommendation from the President or the State Department—which I am not advised of, and, so far as I know, does not exist—to have the American Congress place a condition in the sugar bill under which the people of Cuba cannot enjoy the quotas we prescribe for them, unless somebody in Cuba pays certain claims to somebody in the United States, which claims apparently have not been paid.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator's viewpoint. I merely want to suggest that in connection with the great privilege which we are bestowing upon Cuba, it certainly can be argued that it is not inappropriate to say, "Give us a little reciprocation in the way of fair treatment to our nationals."

I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from Florida was in the room when I read from our Reciprocal Trade Act.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; Mr. President, I was present and heard that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I want to read a provision which also is in our law, which gives us the power to protect ourselves against discriminations having to do with shipping. I shall quote from the United States Code, title 46, section 142. I am simply trying to make it clear that these protective measures in our laws are not at all unusual. The Senator a while ago referred to the Philippine Trade Act. We have a protective clause of that kind in the Philippine Trade Act.

Section 142, of title 46, reads as follows:

> Whenever any foreign country whose vessels have been placed on the same footing in the ports of the United States as American vessels (the coastwise trade excepted) shall deny to any vessels of the United States any of the commercial privileges accorded to national vessels in the harbors, ports, or waters of such foreign country, the President, on receiving satisfactory information of the continuance of such discriminations against any vessels of the United States, is authorized to issue his proclamation excluding, on and after such time as he may indicate, from the exercise of such commercial privileges in the ports of the United States as are denied to American vessels in the ports of such foreign country, all vessels of such foreign country of a similar character to the vessels of the United States thus discriminated against, and suspending such concessions previously granted to the vessels of such country.
> * * *

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President; I am glad the able Senator from Colorado read that language, because I think that is the way to handle such a situation as this. The Senator will note two things about the language which he read. First, it says in substance that if other people do not allow our ships to go to their ports without discrimination, then we will not, perhaps, allow their ships to come to our ports without discrimina-

tion. That is in respect to the class of vessels.

The second, and the important, thing I noted in the language the Senator read is the fact that the Congress gave the power to the President to determine when to use a prohibition which the Congress placed in his hands as a weapon. We do not exercise it arbitrarily here in the Congress. If we should state that the Chief Executive of our country, who represents us in negotiations with other countries, shall have certain power, when he makes demands with respect to practices detrimental to our commerce and they are not met by foreign countries, I would be willing to have that provided in this case, but the Senator from Colorado is proposing an entirely different thing. These claims are not in respect to the Sugar Act or the sugar question, and, in the second place, we do not give our President authority to impose these conditions and restrictions if Cuba does not meet our just demands. We in the Congress arbitrarily impose them.

I think the language the able Senator read is exactly the way the matter should be handled, but it is different from the way it is handled in the Sugar Act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I have read language to the Senator which is closely related to a single subject matter. I have also read language which is much broader. I have also referred to the Philippine Trade Act where similar protective provisions are included.

The Senator has mentioned that he would have a more approving feeling toward the legislation if the President were involved. It is inconceivable to me that the Secretary of State would initiate any important actions against an independent government like Cuba without the knowledge or approval of the President of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator tell us whether either the President or the State Department has recommended or been consulted with upon this amendment?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understand the State Department has approved the paragraph.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator know that of his personal knowledge? If he does, of course I shall take his word for it. I wondered if there was any communication from the State Department.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have talked to representatives of the State Department who assured me that is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to add a word?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator from Florida that it is my understanding that the provision was written into the bill at the request of the State Department. It did not come from any Members of the Senate or, so far as I know, from any Members of the House who have been interested in securing extension of the Sugar Act.

Mr. PEPPER. Can the Senator tell us whether anyone encouraged the State Department to make such recommendations, or did the State Department initiate the contact with the Congress and voluntarily make the recommendation?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The State Department initiated the inclusion of the paragraph in the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I will make one more observation and then, probably, will not take the time of the Senator hereafter.

Mr. President, the best relations the United States Government has had in its history, I believe, were in the days when the good-neighbor policy was the foreign policy of the Government of the United States, when we did not take advantage of our power to impose upon any weaker people conditions that were peculiarly advantageous to us.

It seems to me an extraordinary thing, without us hearing anything about it, that there are unpaid claims of some American nationals from the Cuban Government, or somebody, that the President of the United States has not been able to collect, and that we have got to impose what amounts to an embargo on Cuban sugar exports into the United States in order to get her to pay those claims. It is a surprising doctrine to me that the Congress has become the collecting agency of American creditors. I think that is detrimental to our good relations with our sister Republic of Cuba. I am afraid they will regard it as another evidence of the "big stick" on the part of the United States Government. That is not in the interest of peace. That is not in the interest of the best understanding and the warmest friendship between our two great countries. I exceedingly regret the effort which is made in the bill to make the Congress of the United States the collecting agency for some American creditors about whom we do not even know—at least, so far as I am concerned, that is true—while we are considering the legislation.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I can only say that I have learned with the deepest regret that our State Department initiated the provision which is contained in the bill. It is contrary to the conditions we have been trying to develop in our relations with our South American neighbors. It flies in the face of the good-neighbor doctrine. I deeply regret that it is included in the bill and I am surprised to learn that the State Department initiated it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, while we are granting these great privileges to other countries I think we have a right to ask in turn that our own nationals be treated fairly. There cannot be any other foundation for wholesome and healthy foreign relations. I do not believe the Secretary of State is going to use his office as a collection agency. He has a duty to perform with respect to the just claims of American citizens. If he did not perform them we would criticize him. I do not see any harm in equipping him with a little bit of quid pro quo which will help him do justice to the people who are offering this great privilege to Cuba.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator speaks about a little quid pro quo. I think that is a masterpiece of exaggeration, for the Senator's little quid pro quo amounts to the power to strangle this good neighbor of ours down in the Caribbean, because if we shut off her sugar we shut off her life's blood and we kill her.

As I understand, the claims in dispute, the justice of which I do not pretend to judge, were incurred under another administration, and are strenuously disputed by the present administration of the friendly Government of Cuba. I simply want to point out that when we are putting the power in the Secretary of State to shut off sugar importations from Cuba if the claims against Cuba are disallowed, we are giving the power to the Secretary of State to execute a death warrant on that Republic.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It has been made very clear that the language does not contemplate pushing claims which have not been adjudicated or which have not been acknowledged.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to add one further statement. The Senator from Connecticut is mistaken if he believes that the provision of the bill would permit the State Department or the Department of Agriculture, or require the Government of the United States, in any way to shut off imports. It deals only and exclusively with the excess quota which is here granted, a quota which heretofore was assigned to the Philippines, and to which the domestic producers had some claim.

Moreover, it ought to be made clear again that this provision does not make the United States a collecting agency. It does not make the Congress of the United States a collecting agency. It is clearly stated that the meaning of this provision is simply that when a foreign country, by its own judicial processes, by its own constitutional act, acknowledges a claim, then the failure to pay that claim shall be regarded as unfair and inequitable treatment. But this does not take away from any foreign country the right and the power to adjudicate claims according to its own system of adjudication.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In view of what has been said, I am bound to make my comment on the situation.

I concede that the Government of the United States and the Government of Cuba are entitled to have a reciprocal arrangement under which they each insist upon the recognition of the claims of the other; and a general protocol or

convention to that effect is perfectly sound. If, ultimately, it is violated, I know of no reason why the Government of the United States should not be entitled to look to any recourse available to it. But I cannot for the life of me understand why such an arrangement should be part of a sugar treaty, to be paid in terms of sugar, when it involves a fundamental question of reciprocal rights.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the sugar benefits which are provided for Cuba are the basis of the reciprocal rights to which the Senator refers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator another question? Let us have the record perfectly clear that there is not a single thing about this particular section which is of the slightest interest to our domestic sugar growers, our domestic sugar processors, or producers. They have no interest whatever in it. Is that true, or is it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is true. The Government of the United States, not the producers or processors, is giving this fabulous cornucopia of benefit to Cuba; and as a related act of reciprocity, if we wish to put it that way, it has been provided that our own nationals shall be treated fairly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Are not the purposes of the bill "to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries"? What is there in this particular section, section 202, subsection (e), which has anything to do with the purport of the bill which we are now considering? Senate bill 1584, a companion bill to the House bill now being considered, was introduced by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. What was the purpose of those Senators in getting together? Was it to make the Congress of the United States or the State Department a collection agency or was it, as the bill says, "to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries"? I ask the Senator what was the purpose of those Senators in getting together?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The purpose of the sponsorship was to sponsor a sugar bill, and that is what we have here.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is not the Sugar Act a stabilization act to stabilize the sugar industry?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is one of the purposes of the act.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that section 202, subsection (e), is a brand new section which has never before appeared in a sugar bill?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is also a brand new thing for Cuba to have the increase in sugar which is granted to her by this bill—at the expense, one might argue, of the American producers. Therefore it is not entirely inappropriate, I suggest, while we are doing this generous and fine thing for Cuba, to ask that our own nationals be treated fairly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Colorado has emphasized two or three times that we are doing a great act for Cuba. I think he used the expression "a great cornucopia," or outpouring. Is it not true that Cuba happens to purchase great quantities of our products?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And that it is of mutual advantage to trade with Cuba?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not she purchase our machinery and our automobiles?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Among other items from my own State, she purchases rice. I think she is the largest purchaser of rice produced in Arkansas.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think it is quite fair to leave the impression that this is purely charity. We are trying to promote mutually beneficial trade, are we not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is correct. Also, it should be remembered, our own people who raise sugar beets, or would like to do so, buy those same things.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator from Michigan had the correct view. Since this is a treaty dealing with trade, the kind of procedure provided in section 202 (e) is wholly unwarranted.

If this question were to be decided by an international court, or by arbitration, as our differences with Mexico are decided, that would be another thing. All our difficulties with Mexico are covered by arbitration. In connection with the water treaty, which received so much attention from the able Senator from Colorado last year, the great point was made as to the fine relationship which we enjoyed through the practice of arbitrating our differences with Mexico. That would be a very different thing, and I would have no objection to such an arrangement.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator was not in the Chamber when I read from two or three precedents which show that this is no unusual measure of protection for the United States to take.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Even if it is not unusual, I think it is very bad.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator give us a definition of "nationals" in line 18 on page 8?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say that a citizen of the United States is a national of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Would that include a corporation, a bank, a partnership, or an association?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe it is broad enough to include a bank, corporation, or association.

Mr. LANGER. So if Cuba owed a bank in this country, and the bank wanted to collect, it could go to the office of the Secretary of State, and he would have the power under this section to say, "We will not buy sugar unless you pay that debt."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I cannot think of that turn of events. If we are going to try to get American capital into foreign countries—and that seems to be a part of our national policy—I do not see how we can do it except by following the corporate form. If we follow the corporate form, it seems to me that we must give it protection as well as individuals or associations.

Mr. LANGER. Frankly, I cannot follow the reasoning of the distinguished Senator. If a bank in this country loans money to Cuba, why should it loan it unless it has some security? Why should our Government permit a sugar deal to protect the investment?

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the first instance, it is not a question of why we should protect the investment, the first question is, Why should not Cuba protect the investment?

Mr. LANGER. Why should we hold a pistol at Cuba's head?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not favor that.

Mr. LANGER. In that section of the bill it is stated that the Secretary shall have authority to withhold or withdraw any increase in the share of the domestic consumption requirements provided for such country. Why is not that holding a pistol to Cuba's head?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Any time there is a right to withdraw from a contract or a right to terminate any kind of an arrangement or do that which might inconvenience or injure someone else, the argument can be made that there is a pistol at the other fellow's head. It

seems to me it is a lurid way of expressing something that probably will not happen.

Mr. LANGER. But it may happen.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I doubt very much that it would happen. But let us look at it. We are giving Cuba a great increase in the cut in the American sugar market, and we want the fair and just debts of our nationals paid. Is that putting a pistol to Cuba's head?

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly what it is.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not view it that way.

Mr. President, under the existing Sugar Act it has been within the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to exercise a certain regulation over the wages of the employees of the farmers and over the prices received by the farmers for their cane sugar or their beet sugar. In the case of cane sugar on the mainland of this country and also in our possessions it often happens that the processor is also a big owner of the production, and it can be reasoned from that that he has the opportunity to depress wages and, possibly, to depress the price of the product which is offered to his plant.

I assume that that is the theory on which the act grants those regulatory powers. But in the beet-sugar areas only approximately one-fifth of the acreage of diversified farms is given to the production of beet sugar. Beet sugar is competitive with a number of other crops. It is competitive with beans, with wheat, potatoes, and forage crops. It is so competitive, in fact, that during the war, because the other crops carried higher prices under the encouragement of the Government, there was a certain drop in beet-sugar production. The labor that works on sugar beets is competitive with the labor that works on the other crops in the same area. The processor there does not control the production of the beets. The farmer himself controls the production of the beets, and he is in position to deal at arm's length with the processor. The processor has to obtain the beets because he has an enormous investment in his plants. He has to make his contracts with the farmer. If he cannot make a good contract, the farmer can go into the production of beans, wheat, potatoes, or other crops. Therefore, so far as a price is concerned, it is an arm's-length price, and there is no just reason why the farmers in those areas should be subjected to that kind of control.

We have added in the Senate an amendment designed, in brief, to eliminate the sugar-beet areas from those provisions. There has been objection to that amendment. We are confronted with the necessity of getting a sugar bill by tomorrow. Therefore, most reluctantly, I shall offer a motion to amend the bill by striking that provision; but I wish to say that at least so far as I am concerned, the subject is open whenever we come to the consideration of future sugar legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that I am very happy to hear him say that he is intending to make a motion to strike, because if he had not I would have been compelled to make such a motion myself. I think that is the proper thing to do. It is an unnecessary provision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 23, to strike out all of paragraph (3) of subsection (c) of section 301.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as I understand, that simply means that the paragraph is stricken out, and the House provision on that subject will be taken?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That was added in the Senate. It was proposed from the floor of the House and was defeated there. So, in order to save discussion here and to save a possible stalemate in conference with the House, I am asking that that provision be stricken.

Mr. PEPPER. So that the provision protecting the grower and the worker, which appeared in the 1937 bill and which has appeared in a subsequent bill and is incorporated in the House bill, will also go into the Senate bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to address a question to the Senator from Colorado. Is this a committee amendment which has not been acted on by the Senate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the amendment has not been adopted, rather than moving to strike, would it not be a question of merely not approving the committee amendment?

Mr. MILLIKIN. If it is permissible I should like to move that the paragraph be stricken. It is also agreeable to me that the amendment be voted down; but before the question is put I should like to say this: The Secretary of Agriculture has written a letter to the California Beet Growers Association, Ltd., under date of July 17, 1947, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1947.

CALIFORNIA BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION, LTD.,
Stockton, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: In connection with the proposed Sugar Act of 1948 which is now before the Senate, Mr. Gordon Lyons has told us that your association is particularly concerned about the timing of the fair and reasonable wage determinations if the legislation as finally enacted should provide for such determinations in the sugar beet areas.

We have refrained from making advance statements as to how we propose to administer specific provisions of the proposed legislation because most of such provisions must necessarily be administered in the light of conditions existing at the time the specific provisions are applied. However, the question which Mr. Lyons has raised is one which can be answered by a general policy statement which can be made at this time.

In making determinations of fair and reasonable wages it will be our policy to make the necessary studies, hold the necessary public hearings, and issue the formal determinations in such manner that the determinations can be announced prior to the time the labor, to which such determinations are applicable, is performed. It will be our policy to issue the determinations in such manner that it will not be necessary for farmers to make retroactive wage adjustments as a result of such determinations. This, of course, does not apply to areas in which wage scales are tied directly to average prices for sugar.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

This letter from the Secretary of Agriculture makes it easier to take the action which I am proposing, because a great deal of the objection has come from the fact that the wage determinations have been made after the workers have been paid and have scattered all over the country. Great inconvenience, uncertainty, loss, and annoyance have resulted from that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the situation, if this amendment is not agreed to, it will mean that the bill will be in exactly the same language as it was when it was passed by the House, and thus the bill will not have to go to conference. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct; it will then be passed by the Senate in exactly the same way as the House has passed it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I think it is most unfortunate to include in the sugar bill the provision found in subsection (e) of section 202, with reference to the action of foreign governments in regard to debts owed to American citizens. In the present posture of the world's affairs, we have been endeavoring to bring about continental and hemispheric solidarity with the Latin-American nations. We are soon to have a conference with them at Rio de Janeiro. I think it is most unfortunate that the financial or commercial motive should be brought up.

This subsection provides that—

(e) If the Secretary of State finds that any foreign country denies fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation, or industry, and so notifies the Secretary, the Secretary shall have authority to withhold or withdraw any increase in the share of the domestic consumption requirements provided for such country by this act as compared with the share allowed under section 202 (b) of the Sugar Act of 1937:

And so forth. Mr. President, these matters should be handled through diplomatic channels, as they always have been. We are not the guarantors in respect to the commercial transactions of American citizens who go to foreign countries to do business. When they go to foreign countries for that purpose,

they take the hazard incident thereto, just as they do at home.

Of course, I wish to see American nationals receive their just dues; but this provision puts upon us the moral duty of adjudicating these claims and saying what claims are just and what claims are not just.

I know the report says they must be agreed upon or adjudicated, but I find nothing in the bill that provides a limitation as to what is to be adjudicated or acknowledged.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I wish to say that it was made very clear in the House report, and it has also been made very clear in the discussion here that that is what is meant.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we are not legislating on the basis of reports or on the basis of what is said in the discussion on this floor. We are legislating on the basis of what is written into this bill.

A lawyer who is trying a law suit, looks to the statute, unless it is ambiguous or uncertain, in which case he may rely upon the action of legislative bodies in considering it, or upon contemporary constructions.

But now we are considering the language of this bill. It gives to the Secretary of State himself the right to pass on these matters; but we know that the Secretary of State himself will not be able to pass on all of them. Some person at the head of the Latin-American Bureau or the head of the Cuban Bureau or the head of some other bureau, will determine these matters. Then, instead of acting in the interest of peace and fair dealing and good will, this procedure will stimulate quarrels, perhaps, over insignificant amounts of money, for that matter, between the United States and foreign governments.

I hope very much that the Senator from Colorado in his wisdom and good judgment, which are manifest on many occasions, will not insist upon retaining that clause in the pending bill. I wish to see the Congress enact a sugar bill, of course; but I wish to see the Congress enact a sugar bill that we can stand upon, and on the basis of which we can look the world in the face, and not appear as a Shylock demanding either a pound of sugar or a pound of flesh.

So I hope the Senator from Colorado will agree to have the provision removed from the bill. I do not wish to see our international relations based upon money considerations, or considerations of how many ounces of gold are to be received. I want our foreign relations placed on a high and lofty plane. The only way we can do that is to treat other governments as equals, and not attempt to coerce them or put pressure upon them.

For instance, a United States national who has left New York and has gone to a foreign country and engaged in business there, may have a good claim or a bad claim on the basis of some transaction in which he has engaged in the foreign country. But the claims of such persons can be examined in a proper and impartial way, and the foreign government can see to that. So I hope this clause will not be retained in the bill.

We should let these claims be settled by diplomatic means. We have treaties with most foreign nations. I cannot enumerate them all now; but, of course, we have trade treaties with most of the nations of the world, and usually such treaties contain provisions relative to the handling of commercial transactions and the settlement of disputes connected with them, either by means of tribunals or in other ways.

So I appeal to the Senator from Colorado not to base this bill upon the cold, hard-boiled consideration of how many dollars we can squeeze out of someone on the threat that we will not let them have a sugar quota unless we can exact from them an agreement as to a system of requiring the payment of the claims of our citizens.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, that was not my purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, that is why I ask the Senator from Colorado to agree to have the provision deleted from the bill. I knew it had been suggested by someone else.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I repeat, that in a bill in which we are giving Cubans very generous and handsome treatment, it is not inappropriate also to have in the bill a provision which will assure fair treatment of our nationals. I do not think that is something at which Cuba should take offense. Certainly it is not something at which a United States national should take offense.

I think it cannot possibly jeopardize our international relations. Many persons believe that these things should be on sort of a two-way road, and that when we are dealing generously with other nations they should deal generously and fairly with our nationals.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that we have an ambassador in Cuba, we have an American embassy with a staff, an enormous staff, and all sorts of employees who may present these claims to Cuba and insist upon fair and equitable treatment. Relations between Cuba and the United States since the Spanish-American War, as the Senator knows, have been on a rather fatherly sort of basis, and I want them to continue that way. I do not want to endanger the cordial relations for a few pounds of sugar. We sell commerce in Cuba. If one goes to Cuba and wants to ride up from the station he gets in a Ford, or a Plymouth, or some car of that kind, that we are selling down there. It is the business of the seller to get his money. We cannot send a policeman around with every shipment of commerce to Central or South America or anywhere else.

I hope very much that the good intentions which I know the Senator from Colorado possesses, and the policy about which I know he is so greatly concerned, will cause him to withdraw this provision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I would not want the Senator to get the impression that I have a light-hearted view of this matter. The House of Representatives has passed this provision and it is in the Senate bill. To take it out might pull down the whole thing in dispute with the House, and I think the provision is something which can be sustained on its merits. Most respectfully I say, I do not believe it should be taken out of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, when did a House bill become so sacred that because a provision is in a House bill the Senate cannot amend it? All day we have been amending House bills, and that is what we have been doing all session. They amend our bills, do they not?

Mr. President, the House of Representatives does not mind amending Senate bills. The Senator says "Why, it has not only passed the House, but it is in the Senate bill." Suppose it is in the Senate bill; we can amend the bill, can we not? We have a right to amend it if it appeals to our judgment that it should be amended. The Senator says it may kill the whole bill. This is such a trivial thing on which to hang the fate of the whole bill, whether some claimant gets what he has been demanding that Cuba pay him, and Cuba has not seen fit to pay him.

All these claims are not wrapped up in garments of sacredness. Some of these claims, I have been told by diplomats and others, do not smell very aromatic. Some of them are of doubtful value. I am not going to vote to carry this provision in this bill which places our intercourse with foreign nations on the dollar basis. Here is a great bill, a great measure, which affects the whole world, which affects the people of the United States. Every housewife is affected by sugar. Yet it is said, "Well, if they don't pay some of these claims we are not going to let them have a quota."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Even if we put it on a dollar basis is it not true that during the war and up to the present Cuba has been very fair in the price of sugar when she could have, as some other countries we know of very well have, taken advantage of the situation and charged exorbitant amounts for sugar, which I think is still the only really rationed article in this country. Is not that true?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not sure as to all the details, but I have always understood that was the fact.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator recalls that after the last war sugar went up in price to 25 cents.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not 25 cents now. I think it is only around 10 cents a pound retail. I do not know what the treaty calls for at the wholesale level, but it is much less than that. I think the Senator from Colorado knows it to be true that during the war, when we were very anxious to get all the sugar from Cuba we could get, we had very decent treatment so far as the price was concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to take up more of the time of the Senate, but I do very much hope the Senate will strike out this section. I am very anxious to get the sugar bill through, the people of Texas want it passed. Some prominent Texans have been here for some time interested in getting the sugar bill through. But when we get the sugar bill through, I want the right kind of a sugar bill passed, not a one-way street sugar bill. Let us get one that is fair and that is based upon good will between the nations of the earth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill is subject to amendment, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I move to amend by striking out subsection (e) of section 202.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 17, it is proposed to strike out subsection (e), which reads as follows:

(e) If the Secretary of State finds that any foreign country denies fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, its commerce, navigation, or industry, and so notifies the Secretary, the Secretary shall have authority to withhold or withdrawn any increase in the share of the domestic consumption requirements provided for such country by this act as compared with the share allowed under section 202 (b) of the Sugar Act of 1937: *Provided*, That any amount of sugar so withheld or withdrawn shall be prorated to domestic areas on the basis of existing quotas for such areas and the Secretary shall revise such quotas accordingly: *Provided further*, That any portion of such amount of sugar which cannot be supplied by domestic areas may be prorated to foreign countries other than a country which the Secretary of State finds has denied fair and equitable treatment to nationals of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate long, but I do wish to repeat what I stated to the Senate night before last. Senate bill 1584, and the House bill we are now considering, have only one purpose, namely, to stabilize the sugar industry. Let me read the purposes of the bill:

To regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of sugars and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes.

Amongst the other purposes there is nothing whatsoever that has to do with the bill being made a vehicle for collection purposes.

Mr. President, no one wants to help a foreign country, even a little one like Cuba, to pay its just debts to our nationals, including corporations, which are involved in the section we are considering, more than I do. But there is a proper way to do it. There is a proper way to collect such debts and to ascertain what they are. I think a country such as ours actually should be ashamed of itself that it has to come to the point of inserting in the law a provision such as subsection (e) of section 202 in order to carry out the caprice or whim of American nationals, which are two or three corporations of the United States, and doing it the way here proposed.

Mr. President, is that what we have been preaching? Is that what we fought for? Is that the basis of our policy in Greece and Turkey and China and elsewhere? Is it in keeping with our so-called good-neighbor policy?

Possibly Senators do not think it is important. Of course we can do what is suggested. We are powerful, and there are the votes to pass the legislation, but it is not going to set well.

In a few days, the President of this body and the Senator from Texas will go forth on a noble mission to Brazil to try to spread doctrines we have been preaching—good will and the good neighbor policy. Imagine the look on the faces of the representatives of small countries, such as Cuba and others, when they see the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan, representing the leading country of the world, coming among them after the enactment of such a bill as this. They will not, of course, directly say it to the faces of the Senators; but in their minds will be the thought, "Yours is the most powerful Nation on earth, and yet it finds it necessary to prod Cuba by passing legislation of this type." We can do it if we want to; but is it right, is it neighborly, is it even good manners? Should we preach to any nation in the world, be it Communist or otherwise, about our sincerity of purpose, about our idea of trying to do what is right, and then pick on little Cuba, who might not think she owes those debts. Who is going to decide as to those things? Do we do it that way in everyday life? Somebody says to CHAVEZ, "You owe me $50." And I say "I do not." We go to court about it; but I have my day in court. Let me say that the nationals who seek the payment of claims are of the class to which the Senator from Texas has referred. In this group there is not a claimant who is what we call a natural person. They are only "persons" in the sense that a corporation or agency is called a person in law. Who decides as to the claim? The Secretary of State. Who decides as to the righteousness of the claim, as to the correctness of the claim? Our Secretary of State. Is that good will? Is that international justice? Is that what we have been preaching?

Senators, it is a serious matter, so serious that I made an appeal to this body night before last concerning it. Let us not boast of our might, but let us show the world, including small countries, that we can be just and fair. Let not a great industry such as the sugar industry of the United States say that the Congress of the United States is its "sugar daddy" and the United States of America will collect for it a few million dollars, or whatever the amount may be. It is not right; it is not fair; it is not American; it is not what we stand for. We are not alone in thinking that way.

I want to read an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday morning. It is headed "Cuban Indignation." It reads as follows:

Cuba, neighbor and friend—

Put this provision in the bill, and while she will be our neighbor, and will have to be our friend, yet she will not feel like being our friend—

Cuba, neighbor and friend, has a real grievance against the United States which is so well justified that we hope the Senate will rectify it. The grievance concerns a section in the pending sugar bill which says that if the Secretary of State finds that any foreign country denies fair and equitable treatment to Americans, he is empowered to deny that country benefits accorded under the bill. This is meant to obtain for American nationals payment of private claims they have against the Cuban Government. Such an interpretation, given by Representative HOPE to the House of Representatives and concurred in by the State Department, has created a furor in Cuba.

Why not? When we were poor, when we were small, we would have resented it, and rightly so, if England had enacted legislation of the type here proposed. According to House bill 4075, if the Secretary of State finds that any foreign country denies fair and equitable treatment to the nationals of the United States, he is empowered to deny that country the benefits accorded under the bill.

So perturbed are the Cubans that they threaten to keep away from the coming Rio meeting of the American Republics to work out a system of hemispherical defense.

They are going to be there. They are not going to stay away from Rio or Brazil. But I will wager they wish they were powerful enough to be able to say, "We resent an insult, and the fact that we are now being treated without the respect that should be accorded to any dignified country, such as the dignity and the respect that we pay to humble men in the street."

The club that the State Department has inserted in the sugar bill is a reversion to the big stick policy toward our continental neighbors.

President Coolidge said that "The person and property of a citizen are a part of the general domain of a nation, even when abroad."

I believe that is exactly what the Senator from Colorado had in mind when he stated that American nationals should be protected. I believe they should be protected, but I would not carry it to the extent here proposed.

This attitude was abandoned under the good-neighbor policy. Instead of collecting debts arbitrarily, we decided to put our faith in common principles developed at successive inter-American conferences. The latest pledge was laid down in the Act of Chapultepec. Here the rule was adopted "on conciliation, unrestricted arbitration, or the application of international justice in the solution of any difference or dispute between

American nations, whatever its nature or origin." Cuba, which is regularly meeting payments on her foreign debt, has pleaded with our Government to live up to this undertaking and has pledged herself to go before any conciliation board.

But under the Sugar Act there would be no such thing as a conciliation board. The Secretary of State of the powerful United States would decide the matter.

There is no excuse for our trying to collect the claims of our citizens by this form of legislative intimidation.

Actually that is what it is, legislative intimidation by a powerful country, telling a country that exists by the sale of her sugar, "We will starve you if necessary, if you do not pay corporation A something, in the city of Philadelphia or New York." Probably this is correct, and probably it should be done.

The claims, not being the result of a marketed loan in the United States, are in no special class to themselves. They are inextricably mixed up with the claims of Cuban nationals incurred by old administrations in Havana. They are thus part of Cuba's internal debt. Yet we are threatening to subject the Cuban Government to the embarrassment of making it give the American claimants a privileged position. This is a poor return for Cuba's help to us during the war. We trust the Senate will not allow a bill to go through containing such a flagrant violation of our pledges and our professions. Let the offensive clause be stricken out, and then the State Department could go about the job of composing our nationals' claims through the machinery provided for, as suggested by Cuba and as called for by our obligations.

That is the end of the editorial in the Washington Post of day before yesterday, and it is correct.

Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that every nation, large and small, including England, should pay its debts. Russia should pay her debts. Cuba should pay her debts. But in procuring payment of debts by nations who owe us money, let us follow the well-established customs existing among nations who want to do what is right.

Mr. President, I want to impress upon Senators that the good-neighbor policy has meant much to the smaller nations of this hemisphere. We are the largest nation in this hemisphere. The smaller nations look to us for guidance; they expect from us justice. Today a Senator from a neighboring country, Colombia, appeared on the floor of the Senate. He was presented to the Members of the Senate by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. Speaking in Spanish to me he said, "Senator, we look to the United States to help us, to direct us, to set us an example for the future. It is our desire to be as democratic as you are. It is our desire to have the people of other nations respect us as they respect you, because you treat the people of all nations fairly and justly."

Mr. President, if the bill is passed in its present form, there will be many who will not like it. It will operate to our disadvantage, in spite of all the Senators who may be sent to Rio. My friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and my friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] will be received with open arms, but with suspicion. They will be received as good citizens should be received. But they will be told, "You come to us and speak honeyed words. Your Nation signed the Act of Chapultepec. Your people speak of neighborliness and good-will policies. Nevertheless, the body of which you are Members passed a bill which would intimidate Cuba into paying its debts, whether just or not."

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Holland	Overton
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Jenner	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Stewart
Cooper	McCarthy	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Taylor
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McGrath	Thye
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	White
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Young
Hatch	Morse	
Hawkes	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to strike out subsection (e) of section 202 from the pending bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED. I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who is unavoidably detained, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Washington, if present and voting, would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is necessarily absent, would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has previously been announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Kilgore	O'Daniel
Byrd	Knowland	Overton
Chavez	Langer	Pepper
Connally	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Cooper	McClellan	Russell
Eastland	McGrath	Smith
Fulbright	McKellar	Sparkman
Green	McMahon	Stewart
Hatch	Magnuson	Taylor
Hayden	Maybank	Tydings
Hill	Morse	Umstead
Holland	Murray	Vandenberg
Ives	Myers	
Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Ellender	Millikin
Ball	Ferguson	Moore
Barkley	George	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Gurney	Reed
Bricker	Hawkes	Revercomb
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Buck	Hoey	Taft
Butler	Jenner	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Capper	Lodge	Wherry
Cordon	McCarthy	White
Donnell	McFarland	Wiley
Dworshak	Malone	Williams
Ecton	Martin	Young

NOT VOTING—13

Bridges	Kem	Wagner
Bushfield	McCarran	Watkins
Cain	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson
Downey	Thomas, Utah	
Flanders	Tobey	

So Mr. CHAVEZ' amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, when the amendment was offered, the distinguished Senator from Colorado had not finished discussing the bill. I was waiting until he reached the provisions of section 302 to address an inquiry to the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to have the Senator place in the RECORD the correspondence which he has. It is very illuminating.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe I shall make a statement in my own time.

The question has been raised by some of the producers within the State of Florida as to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 302. They have been somewhat concerned. In subsection (b)

the word "may" is used in the second line of that subsection in describing the powers of the Secretary of Agriculture with reference to the distribution of the proportionate shares of the quota among the producers of sugar.

The producers in the State of Florida who have been concerned have wanted the word "may" changed to the word "shall" so as to require mandatorily of the Secretary of Agriculture that he must, in considering the distribution of quotas, consider the two factors which are mentioned in that section, namely, the past production on the farm and the ability to produce on the farm.

The Senator from Colorado and I have discussed that question and have taken it up with the Sugar Section of the Department of Agriculture. We have been told by the Chief of that Section that in construing the identical provision of the 1937 act it has always been held and interpreted that the word "may" means exactly the same as the word "shall", and that it is mandatory under this provision for the Secretary of Agriculture to consider, in the distribution of quotas, both factors, that is, past production, and ability to produce.

After discussing that matter with the chief of the Sugar Section, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and I requested a formal statement from the Secretary of Agriculture in the nature of an interpretation and amounting almost to an administrative ruling. I have here and would like to have printed in the RECORD at this place in my remarks an interpretative ruling of the Secretary of Agriculture as embraced in a letter dated July 16, 1947, addressed to me.

There being no objection, the letter was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, July 16, 1947.

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request as to the interpretation of the Department of Agriculture of section 302 (b) of the Sugar Act of 1937, the text of that section being identical with the wording of the same section in S. 1584. We understand that some of the Florida growers are concerned about the interpretation of this section.

Section 302 (b) provides that "in determining the proportionate share with respect to a farm, the Secretary may take into consideration the past production on the farm of sugar beets and sugarcane marketed (or processed) for the extraction of sugar and the ability to produce such sugar beets or sugarcane * * *." Inasmuch as the law prescribes that only two factors, past production and ability to produce, be used in determining proportionate shares for a farm, the Department has always construed "may" in section 302 (b) as requiring the Secretary to take into consideration both factors. There is no collateral provision in the proposed legislation, S. 1584 or H. R. 4075, or any legislative history in connection with these bills, of which we are aware, which would either suggest or require that a different interpretation should henceforth be adopted by the Department.

The report on H. R. 4075 by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives confirms our interpretation. The following statement appears on page 8 of Report No. 796 of the House of Representatives: "The proportionate shares (acreage allotments for farms are to be established on the basis of past production on the farm and ability to produce sugar beets or sugarcane thereon."

If you have any further questions about this section, we shall be glad to respond promptly.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I want to say one word. Florida has been in a very unfortunate situation relative to the sugar question, because production in our State came late. Historically, our sugar industry actually began in 1929 When the sugar quota law went into effect in 1935 it was based upon the historical background of the producing areas of the country. That is to say, quotas were awarded to the producing areas on an historical basis. Accordingly, our State, which we have been pleased to call the sugar-bowl of this country, has been limited in its ability to produce sugar by the result of the quota system restricting our production. We have therefore felt that we have suffered by the imposition of restrictions upon our productive capacity in the Everglades area of Florida. The entire Florida delegation has fought, since the Sugar Act has been the law of the land, to get an increased quota, which we felt we deserved. There has been a constantly enlarged quota allowed to us. During the war we extended our production and our processing facilities.

We have not been altogether satisfied with the quota which will be available to us under this bill. Perhaps other areas of the country are not satisfied either. We do feel that we can live for the present under these limitations in the quota system. We hope the quotas will be deferred as long as possible, at least for the next few years, while there is still a shortage of sugar for the consumers of our country.

We do appreciate the cooperation which has been extended to us by the able chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Colorado, in recognizing our peculiar problem in Florida and in assisting us sympathetically, as all the proponents of the bill have done. But we do hope as time goes on we can expand our productive capacity to meet the greater demand.

So we are accepting this bill under the present circumstances with the hope that we shall have the sympathetic interest and cooperation of others who understand our peculiar situation and that there will be more satisfactory legislation in the future.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I have heard a great deal of discussion tonight as to whether cane sugar or beet sugar got the advantage under this bill, and we have debated and tried to strike out, but lacked two votes of doing it, an amendment which was peculiarly harsh to a small but friendly neighboring country. There has been no discussion whatever concerning the basic problem involved in this bill; that is, whether we are dealing justly with Cuba in giving her only the quota she had before the war, except the unfilled portion, for the next 5 years, of the quota of the Philippines, under the Philippines Trade Act.

I think it is generally recognized that the Philippines in 1948 will fill at least half of their quota, and in 1949 will probably fill all of their quota. That means that only for 2 years, as I see it, will Cuba get any benefit whatever from that source.

The second proposition which I have not heard mentioned is whether this bill is in the best interests of the consumers of sugar in this country. We have 2 States which produce cane sugar, and there are 14 States which produce beet sugar. I recognize that they made a very valuable contribution in increasing their production during the war, and I would be very happy to see them get a liberal part of the increased market. But I frankly do not think, Mr. President, that in framing the bill, we have given due and proper consideration to the 140,000,000 consumers in this country, because in giving so large a percentage of our future anticipated needs to the domestic market we are contemplating a subsidy which we will have to keep in operation.

In normal times Cuba can produce sugar for 2 cents a pound. We shall not see the time for many years when we can produce sugar in this country for less than 4 or 5 or 6 cents a pound. We are going to subsidize that market and make our consumers pay in the retail price the difference between that subsidy and what they could have bought it for on a freer market.

I say, Mr. President, with full recognition of the fact that I am wasting my time in saying it, so far as the passage of this bill is concerned, that we have not in framing the bill given due regard either to the proper treatment of Cuba or to the best interests of the consumers of sugar in our own country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4075) was passed.

USE OF SURPLUS BUILDINGS AND LANDS FOR COMMUNITY PURPOSES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Armed Services Committee has had controversies in the past 2 or 3 months respecting pieces of property which are proposed to be deeded to communities for several purposes. This morning our committee reported favorably a Senate concurring resolution relating to surplus buildings and lands for community properties. The concurrent resolution would

request the War and Navy Departments to hold the property and land in question until March 5, when Congress can have an opportunity to look at the problem again and advise the kind of program to be followed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report an original concurrent resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With the indulgence of the Senate, the Chair would like to say that he is familiar with this problem. It involves a great number of pieces of public property in many States. It is merely a stop-gap procedure, and suspends action pending further investigation and consideration, and in the opinion of the Chair should be adopted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is any of the property in question owned by the War Assets Corporation?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes. The measure provides that the land shall be held in the possession of the Army or the Navy, or War Assets Administration, and would not permit the Army or the Navy to declare it surplus until Congress has an opportunity to look over the plan.

Mr. LANGER. It does not include land owned by the War Assets Administration?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; it does include certain lands owned by the War Assets Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) relating to surplus buildings and lands for community purposes was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the War Department, the Navy Department, and the War Assets Administration are requested to delay until March 15, 1948, in reporting as surplus, or in disposing of (1) any lands or permanent structures located thereon declared by any State, municipal, or local government, or political subdivision thereof, through its proper authorities, to be suitable and desirable for its use for educational, recreational, medical, or scientific purposes, or for its use as a public park or place of historic interest, or (2) any lands or permanent structures located thereon which would be transferred for, or devoted to, such purposes or uses under the provisions of any bill or joint resolution pending in Congress if such bill or joint resolution should be enacted into law. This resolution shall not be deemed to prevent or delay the disposition of any such lands or permanent structures to any State or political subdivision thereof under existing provisions of law.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, acting jointly, and the War Assets Administrator, acting individually, are requested to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on or before January 15, 1948, the location, general description, and fair market value of any property described in the first section of this resolution which has been reported as surplus or which it is contemplated will be reported as surplus or disposed of.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate consider Calendar No. 595, Senate Resolution 137.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that following the disposition of this resolution I shall move to proceed with the call of the calendar of unobjected-to bills, beginning where we left off yesterday, at Calendar No. 749. In any event, I shall so move 1 hour from this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I have a statement of approximately 5 or 10 minutes in length.

Mr. TAFT. I cannot yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 137, Calendar No. 595.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 137) to make an investigation of the immigration system, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with additional amendments.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I realize that in the closing hours of this session of the Congress many Senators are interested in particular pieces of legislation which they are anxious to have considered, and I am in full sympathy and understanding with each Member of the Senate in regard to any subject of legislation which he may desire to have called up.

However, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to Senate Resolution 137, which deals with an investigation of the immigration system of our country.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may we have order? I am anxious to hear the Senator from West Virginia, but I am unable to hear him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The occupants of the galleries will be in order.

The Senator from West Virginia will not proceed until the Senate and the occupants of the galleries are in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, this resolution is unlike most of the measures on the calendar, in that it does not have to go to the House of Representatives, to be acted upon by it, but it becomes effective upon adoption by this body. Similarly, it does not require signature by the President.

I may say that this resolution contains nothing which grants any greater power or authority than the Senate Judiciary Committee now possesses. The whole force of the resolution is to enable the Judiciary Committee to set up a staff to study the immigration subject in its various phases.

Mr. President, on March 25, I had occasion to lay before the Senate detailed information and statistical data relating to immigration and naturalization. At that time I stated that the subject of immigration at this time is particularly important, that there are thousands upon thousands of people in the torn countries of Europe who seek entrance to the United States, and that the situation is similar to that which came as an aftermath of the First World War.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken.

The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats.

The Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I thank the Presiding Officer for calling the Senate to order.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to this question, for I desire to have the Senate dispose of it as soon as possible, so that we may reach a decision one way or the other upon this subject, because unless this resolution be adopted before the Congress adjourns, its force and effect will be entirely lost, inasmuch as the real purpose of the resolution is to enable the Judiciary Committee to study this subject during the recess or adjournment of the Congress, so that when the Congress convenes in January, the Senate may be better advised as to the various subjects relating to immigration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that it will not be possible to investigate this matter properly unless the various centers in European countries are visited. Is that true?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator that no plan has been drawn up for the investigation. This resolution authorizes the appropriation of a sum of money for the investigation. The committee has worked earnestly on the subject, and we have found that we need an additional staff.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the committee have no plan? If the committee has no plan, what will a staff be needed for?

Mr. REVERCOMB. We shall need investigators and we shall need an appropriation for the investigation of various subjects.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is why I say that the committee will need a plan in regard to visiting other countries. It will need a plan; will it not?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have no plan as to that, and I have nothing to offer as to that.

As I have said, the situation today is similar to that which came as an aftermath of the First World War, except that the present situation is more extensive.

In March of this year, I also stated that one of the very purposes of my remarks before the Senate was to urge upon the Congress an early and complete investigation and revelation of the entire immigration situation. I shall not now undertake again to recite the

information which I detailed, which had been gathered through the Judiciary Committee, and which I set before the Senate in March; but in support of this resolution, I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to certain general problems relating to immigration and naturalization with which this Nation is confronted, and which have prompted me, along with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], to submit Senate Resolution 137, which calls for a full and complete study and investigation of our entire immigration system. At this point, let me say that this resolution has been reported favorably, by unanimous vote, both by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, to which it was referred in due course.

Over the course of years, Mr. President, the Congress has formulated the policy of this Nation with reference to immigration. Although that policy is crystallized into law, reports are continuously forthcoming to the effect that there are wholesale violations of that law. Although I touched upon this theme in my remarks on March 25 of this year, at which time the distinguished Senator from Idaho referred to an estimate of the Attorney General that illegal alien entries totaled 2,000 daily—I do not know the source of that statement, but it is just such statements and information which come to the committee that really require an investigation—let me say that just recently further information was brought to my attention, to the effect that in the New York area alone it is estimated that there are from 100,000 to 250,000 aliens who are there in violation of the immigration laws of the United States, and the immigration authorities in that area have informed the staff of the Judiciary Committee that they are currently some 32,000 cases behind in their investigations of reported cases.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, again I request that there be order in the Senate Chamber. This subject is very important. I simply cannot hear what the distinguished Senator from West Virginia is saying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair respectfully requests all Senators to cooperate in maintaining order in the Senate. The Senator from West Virginia is making important remarks regarding a resolution of importance to the Senate. It is very difficult for the Chair to cooperate in this matter unless he has the cooperation of the Members of the Senate and also of the occupants of the galleries.

The Chair requests Senators who desire to carry on conversations to retire to the cloakrooms.

The Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. What is the basis of the Senator's estimate that there are 150,000 illegal entries by aliens?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I stated that a report made to a staff member of the Judiciary Committee, upon a recent visit to Ellis Island, where he went at the direction of the committee to make some inquiry, was that there are from 100,000 to 250,000 aliens in the New York area alone, in violation of the immigration laws of the United States.

Mr. McMAHON. Who was the individual?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not know the individual who gave this statement. It was given to me by a member of the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President, it is not a question of whether anyone agrees or does not agree with the law and policy of the immigration into this country or the policy with respect to who may or who may not be admitted into the country, but I assert that the law must be enforced, and that it is the duty of the Congress to make adequate provision for the administration of the law and its enforcement. This cannot be done unless we have before us the facts, and these facts can be gleaned only by thoroughgoing study and investigation of the entire immigration system such as is proposed by the resolution.

Mr. President, I wish to pay high tribute to the small staff of the Committee on the Judiciary for the work they have done, for what they have undertaken and achieved by way of securing information since the first of this year. But it is not sufficient. The staff cannot do it and attend to the other work of the committee.

Generally speaking there are two phases to the problem of the enforcement of our immigration laws. The first deals with the exclusion before entry into the United States of persons who are not entitled under the law to admittance. The second phase deals with the expulsion after entry into the United States of persons who are not entitled under the law to remain. May I just mention briefly certain questions with reference to each phase which in my judgment should be explored as a prerequisite to the formulation of intelligent legislation dealing with the enforcement of our immigration laws?

First, with reference to exclusion procedures, it would appear that insofar as possible the processing of prospective immigrants should be made at the ports of embarkation.

Mr. President, information has been obtained by the committee staff and conveyed to me, to the effect that many of the immigrants, particularly visitors, students, and travelers, who, it will be understood, come under special entry rights and not under the quota, are carelessly processed and dealt with in ports of embarkation and as a result constitute a log jam in our ports of entry when it is discovered that their credentials are improper. It has been suggested that perhaps much of the problem could be solved if legislation were enacted which provided for the assignment of immigration experts to the chief world ports of embarkation who would act as advisers to the consuls in the issuance of visas and the processing of immigrants.

Another question pertaining to the exclusion phase of the problem is the matter of stowaways who are increasing in numbers.

I will say to the Senate that there is before the Judiciary Committee at this time a bill proposed by the Attorney General placing a very severe fine upon any boats where stowaways are found. That has become a terrific and a grave subject, to be dealt with by the immigration authorities. It is much less a problem in the case of airplanes, because a stowaway is easily detected, or cannot get away with the idea of a free ride on an airplane, but in the case of the boats it is becoming an increasingly serious problem, we are advised by the immigration authorities of our country.

I have introduced and we are already studying legislation which attempts to deal with this problem. Still another avenue on which it is desired that study be directed is with reference to some system of coordinating the activities of other law enforcement agencies with that of the immigration service in exclusion work. May I say that from the standpoint of administration it is exceedingly more difficult to deal with an expulsion case than it is an exclusion case because after an alien illegally gains admission to this country there are various procedures prescribed which greatly complicate the problem. Moreover the alien frequently forms ties here which have strong humanitarian appeal and makes his expulsion almost an act of exile or cruelty.

This brings me to the second phase of the enforcement of our immigration laws, namely expulsion procedures. Before an alien can be expelled from the United States the law provides for certain hearings and there is provision for discretionary relief in a limited class of hardship cases. There is also possible relief available through the passage of private bills by the Congress.

Mr. President, I may say that the Committee on the Judiciary has an immense docket of private bills for relief of persons who are facing deportation from this country, and the House has many bills; its calendar on that subject is large.

The question arises, Are these procedures adequate? Is the discretionary relief available sufficiently broad? Should there be a statute of limitation applicable to aliens who are subject to deportation? We have pending before us a bill on that subject. Should there be a limit on the scope and operation of private immigration bills? These are not merely hypothetical questions, Mr. President, but have already been posed by bills which have been introduced in this session of the Congress—bills which can be properly considered only in the light of facts developed by a thoroughgoing study and investigation.

At this point, Mr. President, may I say that there have been introduced in the House and Senate during this session over 60 general immigration bills, ranging all the way from total exclusion of all immigrants to the complete elimination of immigration barriers.

Mr. President, of the 60 bills, 22 are today pending in the Committee on the Judiciary. Two bills I know of would stop the entry of aliens into this country for a period of 5 years. I recall one bill that is pending that would stop entry so long as there may be a million unemployed people in the United States. The effect of that would be to stop entry all the time because generally there are that number of unemployed.

Earlier this month we received a bill dealing with displaced persons. I wish to say that not until July did the Committee on the Judiciary have referred to it any bill upon the subject of displaced persons. The bill in the House of Representatives known as the Stratton bill has been pending before the Committee on the Judiciary of that body. Hearings have been held at length, and I am advised that those hearings are still open. No report has been made by the subcommittee to the full committee in that instance.

When I speak of 22 bills in the Senate and 60 bills in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, I am speaking of general bills; I am not referring to the bills for special relief. These general bills represent very sharp and divergent views.

I doubt if there is any question publicly thought of today upon which there is more division of opinion than upon the question of immigration. That is very well disclosed by the contents of the bills which have been introduced by the Members of the Senate and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I cannot subscribe to a procedure which would result in piecemeal, patchwork legislation with reference to so vital a subject as our immigration laws. Therefore, I have taken the position that these laws should, during the adjourned period of Congress, be considered in a broad perspective, but only after a careful study of the over-all immigration problem; because only with the facts before us, regardless of our feelings, regardless of our views, that may be taken only with the facts before us, Mr. President, can we proceed to intelligent and lasting legislation. Unless we have sound legislation upon the subject, particularly in the face of the great feeling and drive that exists upon it today, we are going to regret very much in days to come, perhaps, any step haphazardly taken.

With reference to the over-all problem of our immigration policy, I want to speak a few words. I believe we may start with the proposition that immigration has played an integral part in the economic growth of our country, as well as in its history. We did not have immigration laws for nearly a hundred years after the founding of America.

The first immigration law came in 1868, but it was a law inviting immigration. It was a law to protect the immigrant from the American citizen. It set up a commissioner that invited immigration. The people who have come here from generation to generation have doubtless played a very important part in the development and in the progress of the country; but the situation must be faced in the light of facts today, not as they were 25 years ago or even 50 years ago, certainly not the time of our first immigration laws. That the United States has greatly benefited through the years, spiritually, economically, and socially, by the addition to our ranks of immigrants from other shores is not open to argument.

From time to time, however, it has been necessary for us to reexamine our policy as to who in equity and good conscience should be admitted into the United States, keeping in mind the best interests of this country. These questions may well be posed today: Are our present quotas proper? What is the present capacity of this country to absorb immigrants in view of the present economic and social conditions? Is our method of determining eligibility to admittance sound? What are the results of experiments in Canada of a selective immigration system? Upon that point, let me say that Canada began in 1945 to give a very definite study to this question. Those who advocated the opening of the doors to all people said that Canada had vast resources of undeveloped land, that it would be a great boon to Canada to admit the people from the world, particularly those who had been so harassed, so hurt in the great war that had closed.

Canada appointed a Royal Commission on the subject. The result was a surprising one to those who had advocated the course to which I have referred. They found that they did not have the undeveloped resources that some had said they had. Canada closed her doors to all immigration in 1946, except people from the British possessions and citizens of the United States, and except those that she selected through commissions set up in Europe, and those she selected were farm workers who have had an experience in farming for 8 years. The last report furnished to me through the committee showed that Canada had admitted about 4,000 Polish citizens, who have gone to the farms and to dairies of Canada. Under the Canadian rule, a man must know where he is going.

A farmer asks for the alien to come. The government sees that the alien is well looked after, that the man who asked for him has shelter for him, can pay him the proper existing wage. The government can move that man any time that it sees fit. After 2 years, if he has earned citizenship, he can and does become a citizen of Canada. I refer to that as the Canadian system that has been set up in our neighboring country to the north.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator whether or not Canada has experienced difficulty with the problem of illegal entry?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not advised on that subject of illegal entry, but I cannot think that she has not experienced it, because we have experienced it, and doubtless Canada has, too; but I cannot answer definitely, because I have not explored that subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, he referred to the fact that Canada had established commissions in Europe to do the screening and selecting.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. Does he know how those commissions were constituted, whether they were diplomatic personnel or civil service personnel or boards of prominent citizens, set up for the purpose, or whether the Army did it?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I cannot answer that question definitely, but it is my understanding that special commissions were sent abroad from Canada into the larger cities. They were sent to Greece, they were sent into Poland, they were sent to Norway, they were sent to France, and into different countries. They screen and select the persons under the laws of Canada to come to Canada. I may say to the Senator that that is one complaint that has come, that our officers, there, perhaps have not been careful enough, and they send them in from ports of embarkation to America; they are caught here as not complying with the laws, and held.

Mr. LODGE. I understand from the Senator, then, that Canada apparently held that the routine immigration procedures were not adequate to cope with this special situation?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Entirely so. I would judge that from Canada's action in the matter and in the creation of these commissions. I will say to the Senator it appeals very much to me as a rather sound course to be considered by any country dealing with the subject of immigration. These and other complex problems can be answered only after study and investigation, such as would be permitted and obtainable under this resolution.

Now, Mr. President, I shall speak with reference to that group of aliens who have been given the designation of displaced persons? It has been suggested by some that Resolution 137 constitutes a delaying tactic. That is exceedingly unfortunate, because I know that many people have been misled by that. Nothing could be further from the truth. Instead of being a delaying tactic, let me say that unless the resolution be passed and we have the opportunity to study this question in the interim between the two sessions, we shall find ourselves as far as information is concerned when we meet again in January just as we are today. There is no delay. The resolution is not delaying anything.

The House has been considering this subject for some weeks. The bill under consideration in that connection is the Stratton bill. The House subcommittee is not ready to report the bill to the full committee. During the present session there will be no action upon that bill which deals with the subject of displaced persons.

Mr. President, I have wondered about the source of certain statements which are being made in this connection. I have wondered where the story originated that delay was being indulged in. I will say, Mr. President, that instead of delaying, what we now propose to do will be the means of obtaining information which we may have in our hands when Congress reconvenes.

Mr. President, I think I have an answer respecting the question of the origin of the story that we are attempting to delay the matter. In the New York newspaper PM of July 18, 1947, I find this headline printed in big type:

Scheme to delay DP entry 2 years charged.

The article continues:

Earl G. Harrison, chairman of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, charged last night that a move is being made in the United States Senate to stall action on the entry of displaced persons "for 2 years at least, possibly until they are dead."

Harrison assailed the resolution of Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, Republican, West Virginia, calling for a broad investigation of immigration laws and policies, including the displaced persons situation.

The statement asserted that the problem already had been thoroughly investigated and that passage of the resolution "will kill all the disabled persons in Europe before they can obtain hospitality in America."

Mr. President, I do not know Earl G. Harrison, but I do know that if he is quoted correctly in that statement published in the newspaper PM he is either very ignorant of the resolution or he has made a vicious, misleading statement.

The resolution itself, as reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, provides that a report shall be made not later than March 1, 1948. Therefore, when Harrison says it will cause delay for 2 years, he is bound to know that he is not telling the truth.

Mr. President, we often have such things said about us in the newspapers. The unfortunate part of it is that this organization, the Citizens Committee for Displaced Persons, has many groups throughout the country. They are putting on a very strong, vigorous campaign. Any organization has a right to do that. Any organization has a right to espouse its cause and to organize. But no organization has the right to mislead the people of the country or to tell what is untrue.

We have now pinned it down to this, that either PM is guilty of misquoting Earl G. Harrison, or Earl G. Harrison is guilty of stating an untruth, and willfully misleading the people of the country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator a question. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia mentioned that the investigation would not cause delay.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr SALTONSTALL. By placing these displaced persons, so-called, in with the old immigration problem are we not making it unnecessarily difficult for ourselves in relation to that part of the problem? The displaced persons in our camps today have been pretty well screened. Investigation has been made and it has been ascertained what their nationalities are, what their religions are, and so on. So is not the problem, so far as legislation is concerned, quite a simple one, to decide how many of those individuals we want to take in, and under what conditions and by what methods we want to take them in? If we include them in the immigration problem as a whole, are we not unduly complicating the problem and causing delay?

Mr. REVERCOMB. And, let me add to the Senator's question, which ones we want to take, and where they will go when they come here?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; we are not delaying that procedure. I cannot feel that the procedure we are now proposing to take will cause delay, for it provides the only effective means of studying the problem in the interim.

Mr. President, an amendment was offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] together with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. It was suggested to me by them that first a report with respect to displaced persons be made not later than January 10. That is entirely satisfactory to the committee. It has met with the approval of every member of the committee, and they have joined in offering the amendment. So there will be no delay in that respect.

I have had the charge of delay brought home to me, because I have received two or three telegrams from individuals whom I know, good people, people who in their hearts have a deep feeling of sympathy, as I think everyone has, for these unfortunate people. They have written to me to oppose the amendment because it would delay. Where do they get that expression "delay"? They are members of the organization to which I have referred, which seems to be headed by Earl Harrison. I made this statement to Senators so they may give such weight as they may please to statements made by Mr. Harrison henceforth.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator accept an amendment, that after the word "advisable" at the end of section 2, a colon be inserted, and the following language:

Provided, however, That the committee shall report its findings and recommendations in a separate report with respect to displaced persons in Europe on or before January 10, 1948?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, yes, I will be glad to accept that amendment. As a matter of fact I was going to offer such an amendment. I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The reason I have pressed for recognition by the Senator, so that I might ask whether such an amendment would be acceptable, is that I must attend a meeting of conferees. I wanted to be sure that such an amendment would be acceptable.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I can assure the Senator from Michigan that it will be accepted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from West Virginia as to how much he is requesting in the resolution for the purpose of making the investigation?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the resolution call for trips around the world, or into Europe or Asia, to look into the subject of these displaced persons, or just what will the functions of the committee be?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The resolution would set out a staff consisting of two stenographers, five investigators, one clerk, and it provides for per diem allowance for eight persons. This is a 7-month job. Then it provides for transportation for investigators and committee members, $10,000. It provides for general expenses, $4,996.01. I may say that these figures, under the rule, were taken to the official who fixes such rates and salaries, in order to conform with proper procedure. The resolution was submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and was favorably reported by that committee. In committee it was examined item by item.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that. I have no doubt but that the Senator and his committee, and the investigators, if they are going to do the kind of job that ought to be done, should be compelled to go to Europe, where the displaced persons camps are, and interview such displaced persons, or at least interview the authorities who are in charge of the displaced persons.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say that I do not know what member or members of the committee will go. I have made no plans myself for going.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not questioning that. The only thing I ask the Senator is whether such trip and investigation would not be necessary if a proper investigation is to be made? It cannot be done here in Washington. If it could be done in Washington, $50,000 would not be needed. It could be done through the regular standing committees, or subcommittees thereof.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator that we are going into more features than that of displaced persons.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to know about the other features. I have been hearing a great deal about displaced persons.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator was not present during the earlier part of my statement.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry. I regret it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The subject of displaced persons is the feature to which first attention will be given, because a report must be made by January 10. So far as going to Europe on a trip is concerned, that would be determined by the committee itself. I have no plans on the subject.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not making any point about that. The only thing I am trying to find out is whether the scope of the investigation would permit the investigators or the committee to go to any place outside the continental United States in order to make a proper investigation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In my opinion it would permit them to go anywhere in the world to make a proper investigation.

Mr. LUCAS. That is an answer, and I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. When this discussion began the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] suggested that we be limited to an hour. I do not know exactly how far we have gone. It has been suggested that 15 minutes remain. I ask the distinguished Senator whether he intends to take the entire time, or whether he will yield to me to make the remarks which I wish to make. I am perfectly willing to wait, if it is understood that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar I may obtain the floor to discuss this question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want the Senator to have all the time he desires. However, my understanding is that we are to continue for an hour or so, and then take up the calendar, and when the calendar is finished we shall resume this work until we complete it—and complete it quickly. I want a decision one way or the other.

Mr. SMITH. That is all right, so long as the situation is understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair may make a statement at this point, with reference to the statement of the Senator from West Virginia that the Senate would proceed for an hour or so on this subject, as the Chair understood the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, which was made just before 9:50, it was that the Senate should proceed with the consideration of the resolution for 1 hour, and that at that time the Senate should proceed to the call of the calendar; and that when the call of the calendar was completed, this question, among others, would come up for consideration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is entirely correct; and at this time I am very glad to have the Senator from New Jersey take the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the hour up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the hour is not up. The Senator from West Virginia suggested that the Senate should proceed for an hour or so. The Chair thought it was well to clear the record at this point. The hour will be up at 10:50.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make the point——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I do not want this discussion to come out of my hour.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it is important enough to let other Members of the Senate know that we expect to proceed with the call of the calendar, beginning at 10:50.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, am I to understand that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia wishes me to continue, now, or wait until he concludes?

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Senator desires to proceed, I wish he would proceed now.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me before he takes his seat?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator had yielded to me.

Mr. STEWART. No; I want the Senator from West Virginia to yield to me. If the Senator from New Jersey has the floor, I shall seek the floor in my own time. I want the Senator from West Virginia to yield for a question if he still has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator from New Jersey has the floor, I shall speak in my own time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that I expect to resume the floor later, and I shall be delighted to discuss the question with him.

Mr. STEWART. I have been trying to get the attention of the Senator from West Virginia, in order that I might ask him to yield to me. However, in the interim it seems that the Senator from New Jersey has obtained the floor, so my ambitions are totally without further hope of reward. I wish to talk with the Senator from West Virginia in his time or my time, on the subject of displaced persons, or misplaced persons, or immigration, or whatever the Senator from West Virginia or anyone else desires to call it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be delighted to hold such a discussion with the Senator after the call of the calendar.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator indicate about what hour of the night he expects to obtain the floor?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not yet advised as to the hour.

Mr. STEWART. I shall endeavor to remain in the Chamber.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, this is such an important subject that I feel we are justified in having adequate debate. I wish to say in the beginning that I fully appreciate the importance of the purposes of the resolution submitted by the Senator from West Virginia. I appreciate the importance of the subject which he aims to study, and I heartily agree with him that such a study should be carried on in all detail, and that we should know what our immigration policy should be.

Mr. President, we have a problem which I submit is not merely an immigration problem. We have a problem which reaches out further than the mere question of the immigration policy of the United States. We have a problem which has been bequeathed to us by World War II.

I wish to emphasize to all who may hear me that that problem consists of such factors as these: There are now 1,000,000 people, victims of the Germans, in the occupied areas, with complete uncertainty as to their fate, and unable to represent themselves. One might say, "Why is that the concern of the United States?"

The next point I wish to make is that of the 1,000,000 persons, 600,000 are in the American zone in Germany. The American Army is feeding 600,000 of those people today in the American zone. The Congress has legislative responsibility for the people whom we are now feeding in the American zone. I wish to note at this point that in making that statement I am not saying for one moment that those 600,000 people should be brought to America.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator believe that because we are feeding those people in Germany we should bring them here?

Mr. SMITH. I just made the statement, if the Senator had listened to me——

Mr. STEWART. I heard the Senator, but I could not do anything but ask him a question. That is the only purpose for which he will yield. I shall be glad to comment further if the Senator will yield for a comment.

Mr. SMITH. I should much prefer to make my statement, because our time is to be limited. The Senator from Ohio asked us to dispose of this question as rapidly as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. SMITH. The responsibility for 600,000 people in the American zone in Germany is on the United States of America at this moment. Those people have been coming there for the 2 years since hostilities ceased. They come from all classes and conditions of people. At the moment I shall not go into the question of what kind of people they are. That is one of the problems which I concede we must study.

But we must determine the question of what the policy is to be with respect to those people. Are we going to permit them to be taken to Russia and made slaves, as other people have been who have been removed to Russia? Are we going to insist that they be sent back to the countries from which they came? They were afraid of the conditions there, and if they go back they will be subject to being purged or otherwise liquidated.

Is there any other way to deal with this question except to face it squarely as a question of resettlement? I submit that there is no other way to deal with it. That was one of the first questions taken up by the United Nations. We established the so-called IRO, or International Refugee Organization, in order to deal with this problem.

I am not saying yet that a single person should come to the United States,

but I am saying that at this point in my discussion the United States has responsibility for 600,000 people, and that it is costing us more than $100,000,000 a year to feed them. Our Army has the responsibility for their care.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator mentioned the United Nations organization. Can the Senator tell me what the United Nations organization is doing, if anything, toward the solution of this problem?

Mr. SMITH. I can tell the Senator what I am advised up to this moment they are doing. The IRO, the International Refugee Organization, was established. As will be recalled, the organization began when we passed the necessary legislation to assist in establishing it. An American whom I am happy and proud to say I know very well is in charge of that organization. He is in Geneva today. He is organizing the activity there to find out from the various nations of the world what can be done with this problem and with these unfortunate people—people who, because of their convictions, resisted the Nazis and have been placed in concentration camps, and are left as victims of their own sincere convictions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am wondering, in view of the answer of the Senator, whether this measure can do anything to augment or aid the committee which is set up under the United Nations organization to do the very thing which we all want done.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. SMITH. I will yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Illinois has asked whether the committee could do anything to aid. The fact is, as the Senator from New Jersey has said, that we are confronted with this proposition. It is now in our laps. We have 600,000 persons in our zone whom we are taking care of, and under the IRO we are urging our country and other nations to take those unfortunate people. But our own country has made no provision whatever to receive any of them. All this resolution does is to permit us to study the question, to give them some little hope that perhaps our country will do something for them.

Mr. SMITH. If I may continue, I want to make a complete picture, and then I shall be glad to yield for questions, because I think we should have questions from all over the Senate floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield further?

Mr. SMITH. I should prefer not to yield for a few minutes, if I may postpone answering questions.

We have a larger problem and a different problem than simply an immigration problem. The problem is, as I have stated, the responsibility for 600,000 people in our zone, our relations with the United Nations, and our cooperation with them in trying to find an answer to the problem after the setting up of the International Refugee Organization. We have made a contribution in the personnel of the staff and in the head of the organization, who is trying his best to set up some plan whereby, as promptly as possible, all the nations of the world that may have room for these people may be invited to take their share. So I have discussed with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] the point that the problem is bigger than simply an immigration problem. As an immigration problem it belongs distinctly and clearly to the Judiciary Committee. I have never questioned that for a minute. I have said it also belongs, in part of its area, to our Foreign Relations Committee. The members of the Foreign Relations Committee are profoundly concerned because of their contacts with the United Nations organization and their responsibility for the IRO. The Armed Service Committee is immediately concerned with the matter, because they are responsible for the American Army. The American Army today is feeding those people.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. How much does it cost?

Mr. SMITH. About $100,000,000 a year; and under the arrangement with the IRO by which all the nations in the IRO take over, we will continue to pay $75,000,000 of the total. I have felt that any committee which is set up should be composed of those who represent that part of our Government which is interested in this problem and which has this responsibility. It is a problem of the Foreign Relations Committee, and, I think, also of the Appropriations Committee; to a certain extent, it is a problem of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, because important labor questions are involved in the whole picture. It is simply a question of how we can have an adequately staffed committee, with adequate personnel to take care of all these problems. In my judgment, we should send a group to Europe this summer that will take care not alone of the immigration question, but of other problems. When that is settled, then the question comes up as to what the regulation should be as to admittance. It has never been suggested that we should by one iota violate any of our immigration laws. Any person coming into this country must enter in compliance with our immigration laws. The question is whether we are prepared to take whatever our share may be and be prepared to cooperate with the other nations of the world in one of the most important and outstanding problems which faces the world today.

So I have asked the Judiciary Committee if they would be willing to appoint members, and I have asked the Foreign Relations Committee to appoint one or more. I would have the chairman of the committee appoint those members. I would ask the chairman of the Armed Services Committee to appoint one or more, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to appoint one or more. When the question is asked as to how many should go abroad, I cannot see that it is possible to say anything but that as many as possible should go abroad and see those people, see what kind of people they are, and whether they are fitted for our type of civilization. It is a broad subject of national policy, and not simply a question of immigration law and protection of the people who come to this country through the gates of immigration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has spoken of certain of the problems. Can it not be handled better if it is not tied in too closely with the whole immigration problem?

Mr. SMITH. I agree entirely. I do not think the Senator from West Virginia has any intention of tying it in behind these other things. He wants to make it the first order of business in January.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not only following the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan, but it is in accordance with the amendment offered by the committee itself.

Mr. SMITH. I agree.

Mr. President, I should like to know how much more time remains, because I want to propound certain questions which it seems to me are very relevant in connection with the matter, and will help to clarify our thinking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are approximately 2 minutes left before the hour.

Mr. SMITH. Two minutes will hardly be sufficient to cover the ground that I want to cover, because I think it is a vitally important question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Senator would like to address questions to me tomorrow, I shall be very glad to try to answer them.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator understand that I shall have the floor to continue and to direct my questions, or will the Senator have the floor?

Mr. REVERCOMB. There will have to be an agreement about that.

Mr. SMITH. I think that is a perfectly fair suggestion. I want also to reserve the point that I may want to come back with further suggestions in regard to the best way to deal with this matter. I will yield the floor to the Senator from West Virginia tomorrow morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to join in this discussion when it is resumed. There

are certain things in connection with the matter which I think ought to be clarified, in order that we may know what sort of investigation is to be made, where it is to be held, and the results of it.

I hope an opportunity will be given, when this matter is resumed—tomorrow, I assume—for some of us who are interested in the matter to discuss it a little further.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour has expired.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR TAYLOR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to the call of the calendar of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 749.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. Earlier in the evening, I made it known that I had a few remarks to make, which probably would take approximately 10 minutes. I did not obtain the floor at that time, and so I was unable to make the remarks then.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to do so at this time, before the call of the calendar is commenced.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I withhold my unanimous-consent request. I hope the Senator from Idaho will not take more than 10 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think I shall.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho has requested unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the integrity of certain representatives of the press has been called into question and the ability of my executive assistant has been called into question and the propriety of certain actions of the junior Senator from Idaho has been called into question. Therefore, I feel that this matter should be discussed briefly.

I was thinking of using the word "facet," so I looked it up in the dictionary to see if it was the proper word to use for the purpose I had in mind, and in doing so I found the word "facade" which means the chief front or face of a building. Mr. President, this matter has many facades, although that word is not generally used in that way. Also in the dictionary I saw the word "fabulous," and it applies to this matter; it means fictitious, fable, passing the limits of belief, incredible. Mr. President, this matter is all those things. It has many facets, more than one facade, and it is fabulous.

So I shall read to the Senate an editorial from Statewide, a publication recently issued in the State of Idaho, at Boise. It speaks for itself, although I may interject a comment or two as I proceed to read it.

The title of the editorial is "Editors Go East."

The editorial reads as follows:

EDITORS GO EAST

"Waste and extravagance" is a theme that Senator HENRY DWORSHAK repeats week after week in his column Capital Gleanings. This is a column that Statewide has not printed, even if it does appear in a number of Idaho weekly papers. We felt that it might be slanted just a wee bit toward selling Idahoans on another 6 years in the Senate for DWORSHAK.

Three Idaho newsmen and one woman journalist have made recent jaunts to Washington and a fourth is reported to be on his way.

Each has written a series of stories on Washington under this editor's note:

"* * * is spending a few weeks in the National Capital writing his view of national affairs which are of interest to Idahoans."

First to go was Bob Werner, Orofino publisher. In his footsteps followed L. R. Scott, American Falls publisher; Nick Ifft, Pocatello editor; and Louise Shadduck, Coeur d'Alene reporter.

Statewide became interested in these Washington sojourns, for we knew that few Idaho publishers could afford the time or the expense of a trip to the National Capital. This investigation was stalemated momentarily in Washington, D. C., when a Senate employee refused to reveal names on the pay roll under his jurisdiction.

Senator DWORSHAK revealed the necessary facts when he invited Statewide to go to Washington. This invitation was rejected since this trip would be financed by Federal funds.

An explanation of this eastward movement of Idaho newspapermen was contained in a letter sent by Senator DWORSHAK.

Mr. President, now comes a quotation from the letter, and here is where the qualifications of my executive assistant are called into question. I quote from this letter from Senator DWORSHAK to Statewide:

"Under the Reorganization Act adopted by the Seventy-ninth Congress (against which I voted)—

Mr. President, the reference is to my colleague the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], not to me—

each Senator was authorized to employ an administrative assistant. Senator TAYLOR has employed a young man named Keefer as his assistant, and I presume that every other Senator has likewise employed an assistant with the exception of myself. Instead of employing a regular administrative assistant, I thought it would be much better to have Idaho newspapermen serve for brief periods as my assistant, in which case they collectively draw the same salary as assistants of other Senators. If I am criticized for such procedure, it cannot be on the basis of unnecessary Government expense, but rather because I take the position that Idaho newspapermen are as well qualified as Mr. TAYLOR'S assistant, or other senatorial assistants, to serve in this capacity."

Mr. President, I selected my executive assistant after careful consideration of the matter; and I resent the implication that anyone can just pick up any old editor, at any place, at any time, and bring him to Washington for 1 month, and that he can do as good a job as my carefully selected executive assistant can. I wish he were here; I would show him to you, and you would immediately see that I did not select him for his beauty, but, rather for his sterling qualities. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. President, to continue to read the editorial:

Statewide cannot respect Senator DWORSHAK'S statement that "I do not desire any publicity at this time."

This paper believes that Senator DWORSHAK should have explained at the beginning that Idaho newsmen were taking a vacation on Government funds.

Statewide believes this paragraph of DWORSHAK'S letter has a hollow ring: "I presume justifiable criticism could be directed at me if I were to limit this program to Republican editors; however, I have invited Democratic and independent editors to take advantage of this opportunity, and in all cases have specifically stated that I would require no political loyalty, but wanted them to function with complete freedom without restrictions."

Who are the four DWORSHAK invited to Washington? Bob Werner is a former employee of DWORSHAK'S; L. R. Scott, of American Falls, is an old-guard Republican—

I can swear to that, Mr. President—

Nick Ifft, of Pocatello, is also a Republican editor—

Mr. President, I can swear to that. He is the editor of the newspaper in my home town—

Louise Shadduck, of Coeur d'Alene, is a prominent young Republican.

Let's see what they sent in these dispatches from Washington:

Wrote Nick Ifft: "There is a feeling of satisfaction in knowing our interests in Idaho are in the hands of a man of the caliber of Senator HENRY DWORSHAK. * * * We have seen him in action, watched him work, and know that there isn't a State which has a more industrious, sincere, and energetic representative on 'the Hill.' He puts in long hours—

Mr. President, let me say that if a Senator has a good executive assistant, he does not need to put in such long hours. [Laughter.]

I read further from the editorial:

his committee work alone making demands on his time and energy which are far beyond those most of us devote to our positions or jobs."

Louise Shadduck voiced the same refrain:

"'A comparatively easy day,' says Idaho's Senator HENRY DWORSHAK after a continuous 10 hours of congressional labor."

And from another of her dispatches: "Idaho's Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, whose faithful following of his desire to get away from the large Government outlays has won admiration of his colleagues * * *."

Quotes from Bob Werner and L. R. Scott are not momentarily available, but in a recent editorial Scott wrote:

"It will be interesting to the people back home to learn that current gossip in Washington is to the effect that if TAFT or BRICKER are nominated for President, the nominee for Vice President probably will be none other than HENRY DWORSHAK."

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, I dissociate myself from these sentiments.

We believe that these visits of Idaho newsmen to Washington fall under the category of shoddy politicking with DWORSHAK and

the visitors equally guilty of a reprehensible subterfuge.

Newsmen—

Woe unto you newsmen. [Laughter.]

Newsmen who accept funds from Government officials, no matter under what guise it comes, are indulging in the practices that made the press of France venal. This debasement of the French press led to corruption that weakened the nation until it toppled when the Germans gave one lusty shove.

Mr. President, I should just like to read a very brief editorial from the Twin Falls Times-News. This is a paper of large daily circulation, perhaps the second largest in our State, and it bears out what is said here.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like two more minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for three additional minutes. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the President pro tempore.

The heading of this editorial is "Gossip About DWORSHAK." It reads:

GOSSIP ABOUT DWORSHAK

We have been getting reports right along that HENRY DWORSHAK, United States Senator from Idaho, is gaining in stature in Washington. In fact, it is not an uncommon occurrence for Senator DWORSHAK to be found in conference now and then with some of the biggest wigs in the Republican Party.

It will be interesting for the people back home to learn that current gossip in Washington is to the effect that if TAFT or BRICKER is nominated for President, the Republicans' nominee for Vice President probably will be none other than HENRY DWORSHAK.

Surprising as that might seem, there are several reasons why the Republicans might choose DWORSHAK. The Idaho Senator has an excellent personality which, with his speaking ability, makes a good combination. He could probably do an effective job of winning western support for his party.

Here, Mr. President, is the main reason why they are going to nominate the junior Senator from Idaho as Vice President:

Then there's another factor not to be overlooked—Idaho's other United States Senator, GLEN TAYLOR, New Dealish Democrat. TAYLOR is commanding altogether too much attention on such issues as labor and reclamation for him to be ignored by his opponents. With DWORSHAK, another westerner, up for Vice President, TAYLOR might find it more difficult edging himself into the spotlight.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, I wish to say that I am happy to have brought this great honor to the State of Idaho, that we are about to have a Vice Presidential candidate, and while I may never attain that height, I at least have by my efforts raised myself up to such heights that they must nominate my junior colleague for Vice President so that he may outshine me. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have just received a great shock. I have just been informed of a fact, if indeed it be a fact, that almost destroys my faith in mankind.

I have just shown, Mr. President, how I, by my humble but sincere efforts, have struggled onward and upward until I had achieved a certain prestige and, according to the Republican press of my own State, a degree of fame as a liberal statesman. A defender of those who labor, an advocate of developing our great State of Idaho.

As I say, Mr. President, I have reached these modest heights only to find that by my very efforts and achievements, I had caused my junior colleague to be catapulted upward to stand upon my shoulders where his outstretched hands are eagerly reaching for that coveted prize, the Vice Presidency of the United States of America. The gaudy bauble is almost within his grasp. Even though I occupy an inferior position I am happy. My efforts are about to bring the Vice Presidency to my junior colleague and a great honor to Idaho.

If TAFT or BRICKER is nominated DWORSHAK is Vice President. But, Mr. President, I am disillusioned. The people of Idaho are absolutely ungrateful. My efforts to make HENRY DWORSHAK Vice President have come to naught.

You ask what has happened, Mr. President? I have just been informed that the Idaho Republican leadership has announced that they are supporting Mr. Dewey.

INCOME TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the tax bill is dead for this session, and, although there has been a lot of heat and a lot of breast-thumping over this corpse, I think that deep down inside of every one of us, of every Member of Congress and of every citizen who on the one hand knows what that bill really contained and who on the other hand loves his country, there is a real sense of relief that this iniquitous legislation to lower taxes for the very rich in a veritable windfall and to lower them for the average wage earner by exactly 54 cents a week is a dead duck in this Congress and for this year.

At the same time, however, many citizens are still unfamiliar with the details of the Republican-sponsored tax bill which Mr. Truman twice was forced to veto as the wrong kind of bill at the wrong time. Many citizens, average-income citizens, are still under the impression that this bill would have done them some real good. They recognize, of course, that the very rich would have reaped a windfall from it, but they thought that they would have received some substantial tax relief themselves.

For that reason, I have had some tables prepared showing exactly what this tax-reduction bill would have done, and showing it in terms everyone can understand. These tables show what the taxes were for various income groups in 1939, before we began raising taxes in preparation for defense and war needs; what they are now, and what they would have been under the twice-vetoed tax bill; they show, further, what percentage of increase in a man's taxes since 1939 would have been removed; they show the percentage of increase in his take-home pay under the twice-vetoed legislation; and they show what the actual increase in a taxpayer's take-home pay would have been, both annually and, more important, by the week.

I do not want to debate the twice-vetoed tax bill at this late date in the proceedings, but I want to point out just one or two things these tables disclose so glaringly.

They show, for instance, that the take-home pay increase for the average wage earner, the family man with two children, earning $2,500 a year, under this twice-vetoed bill would have been the magnificent sum of 54 cents a week, whereas the man making $50,000 a year would have had a take-home pay increase of nearly $100 a week—$92.73, to be exact—and the scale shoots up like that with the $100,000 a year man getting his weekly pay raised by this legislation by $239 a week, the $500,000 a year man getting a raise of $1,255 a week, and the $6,000,000 a year man taking home more than a half million dollars more a year, or $10,384 a week. This bill would have been good for him, fine and dandy.

Another tabulation, equally revealing, shows how the lower-income groups—not poor people, but average wage earners earning about $50 a week or so—would have had about 30 percent of their increase in taxes since 1939 removed by this legislation, whereas the top-income groups, those making $250,000 up, would have had from 65 to 98 percent of their wartime increases in tax rates wiped off the books.

Another tabulation shows how the persons earning up to $8,000 would have had their take-home pay increased by from 1 percent to less than 4 percent by this bill, whereas those in the very high brackets would have had their take-home pay increased anywhere from 20 to 62 percent. That is a big percentage of increase in take-home pay, I should say. I should also say that had these fortunate taxpayers in the very high brackets succeeded in getting their tax windfall as proposed by the Republican Party, they certainly would have felt obliged to show their appreciation in an appropriate manner to the Republican campaign next year.

I have got another table here which I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with these remarks. It shows how many taxpayers there are in each income classification in Pennsylvania. It is also very interesting, especially in relation to this tax bill.

It shows that there were 3,299,341 taxpayers in the State in the tax year 1943. They are the best figures—the latest figures—I could readily obtain and they may be a little out of date. But they are symptomatic. They show that of these 3,299,341 taxpayers in 1943, all but 103,563 earned less than $5,000; that is, about 3 percent earned more than $5,000 a year and about 97 percent earned less.

Yet you will notice from these previous tables that the big windfalls come at the very narrow funnel end up in that group of 3 percent, with those at the very top getting the gravy whereas other taxpayers, even those earning up to $8,000 a

year would get a weekly take-home pay raise of less than $5 a week, and the average worker getting only 54 cents a week more. There are 2,723,813 taxpayers out of the 3,299,341 of 1943 who earned less than $3,000 a year and whose tax reduction would amount to 54 cents or a dollar ten or so a week and none of them would have gotten as much as $2 a week more to spend.

Mr. President, that means 82 percent of all Pennsylvania taxpayers would have gotten nickles and dimes in tax reductions, to a maximum of $1.87 a week for a single man earning $3,000 a year, but most of them getting $1.10 or 54 cents a week more. Another sizable group, 15 percent, earning from $3,000 to $5,000, would have gotten their taxes reduced by from $1.10 a week—about $57 a year—up to, at the most, $3.56 for a single man earning $5,000. Most, of course, even in this group would get less.

At the other end of the scale, among the top 3 percent earning $5,000 a year or more, are 2,619 taxpayers whose incomes in 1943 were $50,000 a year or more. Now this is a sizable number of big income earners in that class, and most of them are good Republicans and many are good contributors to the GOP. Yet, although they make up only a tiny fraction of 1 percent of all taxpayers in Pennsylvania, they would be the only group which would really feel the tax-relief advantages of the Republican bill to any substantial degree, and they would feel it to the tune of an increase in their take-home pay of from $92.73 a week up to somewhere in the neighborhood of $7,000 or $8,000 or more a week to spend. Of course there are only a very few at the very top to receive such a tremendous tax reduction, but there would be 2,600 taxpayers in Pennsylvania enjoying at least $5,000 more a year to spend while 2,723,813 Pennsylvania taxpayers have from $28 to $97 more to spend. And new State taxes will eat up most of the increased spending money the average taxpayers in Pennsylvania would have received under this wrong-wrong twice-vetoed tax grab bill of the Republican Party.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point some tables which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of individual income taxes for 1939, under present law,[1] and under the House bill (H. R. 1), for specified amounts of net income and for specified family relationships

Net income before personal exemption	Tax paid in 1939 [2]			Present law tax			Tax under the House bill (H. R. 1) [3]		
	Single person, no dependents	Married person—		Single person, no dependents	Married person—		Single person, no dependents	Married person—	
		No dependents	2 dependents		No dependents	2 dependents		No dependents	2 dependents
$1,000				$95			$67		
$1,500	$14			190	$95		133	$67	
$2,000	32			285	190		228	133	
$2,500	50			380	285	$95	304	228	$67
$3,000	68	$8		485	380	190	388	304	133
$3,500	86	26		589	485	285	471	388	228
$4,000	104	44	$12	694	589	380	555	471	304
$4,500	122	62	30	798	694	485	638	555	388
$5,000	140	80	48	922	798	589	737	638	471
$6,000	216	116	84	1,169	1,045	798	935	836	638
$8,000	378	248	156	1,720	1,577	1,292	1,376	1,262	1,034
$10,000	560	415	343	2,347	2,185	1,862	1,877	1,748	1,490
$15,000	1,104	924	831	4,270	4,047	3,639	3,416	3,238	2,911
$20,000	1,834	1,589	1,469	6,645	6,394	5,890	5,316	5,115	4,712
$25,000	2,804	2,489	2,327	9,362	9,082	8,522	7,490	7,266	6,817
$50,000	9,334	8,869	8,621	25,137	24,795	24,111	20,110	19,836	19,289
$75,000	19,484	18,779	18,403	43,477	43,092	42,323	34,781	34,474	33,858
$100,000	33,354	32,469	31,997	63,541	63,128	62,301	50,833	50,502	49,841
$250,000	129,284	128,294	127,766	191,772	191,340	190,475	153,417	153,072	152,380
$302,896 [4]	165,271	164,571	164,711	237,500	237,500	237,500	190,000	190,000	190,000
$500,000	305,224	304,144	303,568	407,897	407,465	406,600	342,460	342,074	341,300
$1,000,000	680,184	679,044	678,436	840,147	839,715	838,850	729,210	728,824	728,050
$2,000,000	1,450,174	1,449,019	1,448,403	1,704,647	1,704,215	1,703,350	1,502,710	1,502,324	1,501,550
$5,000,000	3,790,164	3,788,994	3,788,370	[5] 4,275,000	[5] 4,275,000	[5] 4,275,000	3,823,210	3,822,824	3,822,050
$6,000,000	4,580,154	4,578,969	4,578,337	[5] 5,130,000	[5] 5,130,000	[5] 5,130,000	[6] 4,590,000	[6] 4,590,000	[6] 4,590,000

Net income before personal exemption	Percent of increase in tax since 1939 removed by House bill (H. R. 1)			Percent of increase in take-home pay from 1946 represented by reductions in House bill (H. R. 1)			Actual annual dollar increase in spending money under House bill (H. R. 1)			Weekly increase in take-home pay under House bill (H. R. 1)		
	Single person, no dependents	Married person		Single person, no dependents	Married person		Single person, no dependents	Married person		Single person, no dependents	Married person	
		No dependents	2 dependents		No dependents	2 dependents		No dependents	2 dependents		No dependents	2 dependents
$1,000	29.5			3.1			$28			$0.54		
$1,500	32.4	29.5		4.4	2.0		57	$28		1.10	$0.54	
$2,000	22.5	30.0		3.3	3.1		57	57		1.10	1.10	
$2,500	23.0	20.0	29.5	3.6	2.6	1.2	76	57	$28	1.46	1.10	$0.54
$3,000	23.3	20.4	30.0	3.9	2.9	2.0	97	76	57	1.87	1.46	1.10
$3,500	23.5	21.1	20.0	4.1	3.2	1.8	118	97	57	2.27	1.87	1.10
$4,000	23.6	21.7	20.7	4.2	3.5	2.1	139	118	76	2.67	2.27	1.46
$4,500	23.7	22.0	21.3	4.3	3.7	2.4	160	139	97	3.08	2.67	1.87
$5,000	23.7	22.3	21.8	4.5	3.8	2.7	185	160	118	3.56	3.08	2.27
$6,000	24.6	22.5	22.4	4.8	4.2	3.1	234	209	160	4.50	4.02	3.08
$8,000	25.6	23.7	22.7	5.5	4.9	3.9	344	315	258	6.62	6.06	4.96
$10,000	26.3	24.7	24.5	6.1	5.6	4.6	470	437	372	9.04	8.40	7.15
$15,000	27.0	25.9	25.9	8.0	7.4	6.4	854	809	728	16.42	15.56	14.00
$20,000	27.6	26.6	26.6	10.0	9.4	8.3	1,329	1,279	1,178	25.56	24.60	22.65
$25,000	28.6	27.5	27.5	12.0	11.4	10.3	1,872	1,816	1,705	36.00	34.92	32.79
$50,000	31.8	31.1	31.1	20.2	19.7	18.6	5,027	4,959	4,822	96.67	95.37	92.73
$75,000	36.2	35.4	35.4	27.6	27.0	25.9	8,696	8,618	8,465	167.23	165.73	162.79
$100,000	42.1	41.2	41.1	34.9	34.2	33.1	12,708	12,626	12,460	244.38	242.81	239.62
$250,000	61.4	60.7	60.7	65.9	65.2	64.0	38,355	38,268	38,095	737.60	735.92	732.60
$302,896 [4]	65.8	65.1	65.3	72.6	72.1	71.0	47,500	47,500	47,500	913.46	913.46	913.46
$500,000	63.7	63.3	63.4	71.0	70.7	69.9	65,437	65,391	65,300	1,258.40	1,257.52	1,255.77
$1,000,000	69.4	69.0	69.1	69.4	69.2	68.8	110,937	110,891	110,800	2,133.40	2,132.52	2,130.77
$2,000,000	79.4	79.1	79.2	68.4	68.3	68.0	201,937	201,891	201,800	3,883.40	3,882.52	3,880.77
$5,000,000	93.2	93.0	93.1	62.3	62.4	62.5	451,790	452,176	452,950	8,688.27	8,695.69	8,710.58
$6,000,000	98.2	98.0	97.9	62.1	62.1	62.1	540,000	540,000	540,000	10,384.62	10,384.62	10,384.62

[1] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Revenue Act of 1945.
[2] Assumes maximum earned net income.
[3] Assumes taxpayer is under 65 years of age.
[4] Point at which 15 percent reduction of present law tentative tax would take effect under House bill for single person with no dependents. Point is $303,396 for married person with no dependents, $303,896 for married person with 1 dependent, $304,396 for married person with 2 dependents, and $304,896 for married person with 3 dependents. Taxes are calculated at these different points for the different relationships.
[5] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 85.5 percent.
[6] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 76.5 percent.

Individual income tax returns filed in Pennsylvania for the tax year 1943

[Income classes in thousands of dollars]

Type of return and income classes:	Number of returns
Form 1040–A (adjusted gross income classes):	
Under 1	424,812
1 under 2	689,487
2 under 3	523,265
Form 1040 (net income classes):	
Under 1	180,455
1 under 2	418,440
2 under 3	487,354
3 under 4	371,864
4 under 5	100,101
5 under 6	31,268
6 under 7	15,742
7 under 8	10,134
8 under 9	6,970
9 under 10	5,578
10 under 11	4,254
11 under 12	3,343
12 under 13	2,770
13 under 14	2,303
14 under 15	1,904
15 under 20	6,601
20 under 25	3,836
25 under 30	2,310
30 under 40	2,660
40 under 50	1,271
50 under 60	809
60 under 70	488
70 under 80	306
80 under 90	221
90 under 100	180
100 under 150	360
150 under 200	116
200 under 250	47
250 under 300	24
300 under 400	27
400 under 500	19
500 under 750	17
750 under 1,000	1
1,000 under 1,500	1
1,500 under 2,000	
2,000 under 3,000	1
3,000 under 4,000	1
4,000 under 5,000	1
5,000 and over	
Total	3,299,341

Source: Bureau of Internal Revenue.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following additional reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. R. 3632. A bill to extend the time within which applications may be made to the Railroad Retirement Board for certain refunds from the Unemployment Trust Fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 768);

H. R. 3682. A bill to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollment; without amendment (Rept. No. 769); and

H. R. 3870. A bill to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 770).

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—ADDITIONAL REPORT ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, according to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Federal personnel within the United States during the month of June decreased $59,277 from a total of 1,914,333 in May to 1,855,056 in June. Excluding War and Navy Departments, personnel decreased 14,094 from the May figure of 1,209,546 to the June figure of 1,195,452. The War Department within the continental United States decreased 37,913 from the May figure of 391,129 to the June figure of 353,216. The Navy Department within the United States decreased 7,270 from the May figure of 313,658 to the June figure 306,388. (See table I.)

Outside the continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 6,932 from the May total of 263,759 to the June total of 256,827. The majority of the workers outside the United States were industrial workers. (See tables II and IV.) Exclusive of War and Navy Departments, there was a decrease of 535 from the May figure of 55,321 to the June figure of 54,786.

The consolidated table, presenting figures on personnel inside and outside the United States, shows a total decrease of 55,212 from the May total 2,178,092 to the June total of 2,112,880. If the War and Navy Departments' reductions are excluded, there was a decrease of 13,632 employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government from the May figure of 1,264,867 to the June figure of 1,251,235. (See table III.)

Industrial employment during the month of May decreased 19,772 from the May total of 596,369 to the June total of 576,597. Of this total reduction, 19,724 industrial workers were eliminated by the War and Navy Departments, and only 48 by the other agencies and departments. The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government, who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees. (See table IV.)

I ask unanimous consent to present the report and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 601 OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1941 ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL, MAY–JUNE 1947

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH JUNE 1947, AND COMPARISON WITH MAY 1947

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Federal personnel within the United States during the month of June decreased 59,277 from a total of 1,914,333 in May to 1,855,056 in June. Excluding War and Navy Departments, personnel decreased 14,094 from the May figure of 1,209,546 to the June figure of 1,195,452. The War Department within the continental United States decreased 37,913 from the May figure of 391,129 to the June figure of 353,216. The Navy Department within the United States decreased 7,270 from the May figure of 313,658 to the June figure of 306,388. (See table I.)

Outside the continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 6,932 from the May total of 263,759 to the June total of 256,827. The majority of the workers outside the United States were industrial workers. (See tables II and IV.) Exclusive of War and Navy Departments, there was a decrease of 535 from the May figure of 55,321 to the June figure of 54,786.

The consolidated table, presenting figures on personnel inside and outside the United States, shows a total decrease of 55,212, from the May total of 2,178,092 to the June total of 2,112,880. If the War and Navy Departments' reductions are excluded, there was a decrease of 13,632 employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government from the May figure of 1,264,867 to the June figure of 1,251,235. (See table III.)

Industrial employment during the month of May decreased 19,772 from the May total of 596,369 to the June total of 576,597. Of this total reduction, 19,724 industrial workers were eliminated by the War and Navy Departments, and only 48 by the other agencies and departments. The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government, who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees. (See table IV.)

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1947, and comparison with May 1947*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):				
Agriculture Department	88,909	89,072	163	
Commerce Department	35,916	35,409		507
Interior Department	47,307	48,142	835	
Justice Department	24,293	23,249		1,044
Labor Department	6,030	5,002		1,028
Post Office Department	468,001	470,280	2,279	
State Department	8,084	7,844		240
Treasury Department	98,414	93,879		4,535
Emergency war agencies:				
Office of Defense Transportation	96	91		5
Office of Scientific Research and Development	100	74		26
Selective Service System	1,567	1,084		483
Postwar agencies:				
Council of Economic Advisers	42	44	2	
Office of Government Reports	139	135		4
Office of Housing Expediter	9,253	8,594		659
Postwar agencies—Continued				
Office of Temporary Controls: Office of Price Administration [1]	1,115			[1] 1,115
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2		
Price Decontrol Board	5	5		
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,165	4,214	49	
War Assets Administration	44,733	41,421		3,312
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	3		
Bureau of the Budget	603	564		39
Civil Aeronautics Board	532	536	4	
Civil Service Commission	3,476	3,483	7	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	115	116	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,306	1,292		14
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,170	1,159		11
Federal Power Commission	766	763		3
Federal Security Agency	32,487	31,339		1,148

[1] The decrease of 1,115 employees indicated here for the Office of Price Administration is due to the abolishment of OPA as such. However, these employees have been distributed to the Commerce Department, the Agriculture Department, the Office of Housing Expediter, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1947, and comparison with May 1947*—Continued

Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued				
Federal Trade Commission	584	591	7	
Federal Works Agency	24,694	24,331		363
General Accounting Office	10,759	10,629		130
Government Printing Office	7,884	7,786		98
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,271	2,281	10	
Maritime Commission	10,900	10,313		587
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,897	5,920	23	
National Archives	394	384		10
National Capital Housing Authority	283	277		6
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	18	19	1	
National Gallery of Art	311	312	1	
National Housing Agency	14,937	14,657		280
National Labor Relations Board	824	816		8
National Mediation Board	111	110		1
Panama Canal	554	658	104	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,673	2,645		28
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,723	7,592		131
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,170	1,159		11
Smithsonian Institution	504	519	15	
Tariff Commission	231	230		1
Tax Court of the United States	123	123		
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,098	14,258	160	
Veterans' Administration	223,974	222,046		1,928
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,209,546	1,195,452	3,661	17,755
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			14,094	
Navy Department	313,658	306,388		7,270
War Department	391,129	353,216		37,913
Total, including War and Navy Departments	1,914,333	1,855,056	3,661	62,938
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			59,277	

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1947, as compared with May 1947*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):				
Agriculture Department	1,459	1,388		71
Commerce Department	3,082	3,094	12	
Interior Department	4,421	4,839	418	
Justice Department	382	382		
Labor Department	84	80		4
Post Office Department	1,472	1,507	35	
State Department	13,671	13,595		76
Treasury Department	710	653		57
Emergency war agencies: Selective Service System	27	32	5	
Postwar agencies:				
Office of Housing Expediter	44	39		5
Philippine Alien Property Administration	96	108	12	
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	1	1		
War Assets Administration	487	520	33	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	95	94		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	13	14	1	
Civil Service Commission	5	5		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	1	1		
Independent agencies—Continued				
Federal Communications Commission	36	37	1	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3		
Federal Security Agency	1,106	1,199	93	
Federal Works Agency	319	291		28
Maritime Commission	324	251		73
National Housing Agency	47	47		
National Labor Relations Board	2	2		
Panama Canal	25,477	24,767		710
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	122	126	4	
Smithsonian Institution	8	8		
Veterans' Administration	1,827	1,703		124
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	55,321	54,786	614	1,149
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			535	
Navy Department	52,403	52,044		359
War Department	156,035	149,997		6,038
Total, including War and Navy Departments	263,759	256,827	614	7,546
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			6,932	

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1947*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):				
Agriculture Department	90,368	90,460	92	
Commerce Department	38,998	38,503		495
Interior Department	51,728	52,981	1,253	
Justice Department	24,675	24,631		44
Labor Department	6,114	5,082		1,032
Post Office Department	469,473	471,787	2,314	
State Department	21,755	21,439		316
Treasury Department	99,124	94,532		4,592
Emergency war agencies:				
Office of Defense Transportation	96	91		5
Office of Scientific Research and Development	100	74		26
Selective Service	1,594	1,116		478
Postwar agencies:				
Council of Economic Advisers	42	44	2	
Office of Government Reports	139	135		4
Office of Housing Expediter	9,297	8,633		664
Office of Temporary Controls: Office of Price Administration [1]	1,115			[1] 1,115
Philippine Alien Property Administration	98	110	12	
Price Decontrol Board	5	5		
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,166	4,215	49	
War Assets Administration	45,220	41,941		3,279
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	98	97		1
Bureau of the Budget	603	564		39
Civil Aeronautics Board	545	550	5	
Civil Service Commission	3,481	3,488	7	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	116	117	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,342	1,329		13
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,173	1,159		14
Federal Power Commission	766	763		3
Federal Security Agency	33,593	32,538		1,055
Federal Trade Commission	584	591	7	
Federal Works Agency	25,013	24,622		391
General Accounting Office	10,759	10,629		130
Government Printing Office	7,884	7,786		98
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,271	2,281	10	
Maritime Commission	11,224	10,564		660
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,897	5,920	23	
National Archives	394	384		10
National Capital Housing Authority	283	277		6
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	18	19	1	
National Gallery of Art	311	312	1	
National Housing Agency	14,984	14,704		280
National Labor Relations Board	826	818		8
National Mediation Board	111	110		1
Panama Canal	26,031	25,425		606
Railroad Retirement Board	2,673	2,645		28
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,845	7,718		127
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,170	1,159		11
Smithsonian Institution	512	527	15	
Tariff Commission	231	230		1
Tax Court of the United States	123	123		
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,098	14,258	160	
Veterans' Administration	225,801	223,749		2,052
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,264,867	1,251,235	3,952	17,584
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			13,632	
Navy Department	366,061	358,432		7,629
War Department:				
Inside the continental United States	391,129	353,216		27,913
Outside continental United States	156,035	149,997		6,038
Total, including War and Navy Departments	2,178,092	2,112,880	3,952	59,164
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			55,212	

[1] The decrease of 1,115 employees indicated here for the Office of Price Administration is due to the abolishment of OPA as such. However these employees have been distributed to the Commerce Department, the Agriculture Department, the Office of Housing Expediter, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the continental United States, employed by executive agencies during June 1947*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except War and Navy Departments):				
Commerce Department	1,310	1,509	199	
Interior Department	7,209	7,596	387	
State Department	318	328	10	
Treasury Department	4,590	3,861		729
Postwar agencies:				
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	557	487		70
Independent agencies:				
National Housing Agency	10	9		1
Panama Canal	2,241	2,193		48
Tennessee Valley Authority	7,007	7,211	204	
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	23,242	23,194	800	848
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments			48	

Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Navy Department	253,909	249,891		4,018
War Department:				
Inside continental United States	194,429	184,098		10,331
Outside continental United States	124,789	119,414		5,375
Total, including War and Navy Departments	596,369	576,597	800	20,572
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			19,772	

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—REPORT ON FEDERAL LENDING (S. DOC. NO. 103)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee on the subject of Federal lending.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures just laid before the Senate is the result of a study on Federal lending which has been compiled for the committee as a supplement to a previous study on assets of wholly owned Federal corporations.

The study reveals a cumulative total of $109,500,000,000 in loans under a hodge-podge of Federal-lending programs. This figure includes the estimates for fiscal years 1947 and 1948.

In the total are $57,250,000,000 in domestic direct loans, $44,750,000,000 in domestic guaranteed loans, and approximately $7,000,000,000 in foreign loans.

As of June 30, 1946, there was a principal outstanding of $5,800,000,000 on direct loans.

The data are a result of extensive study on the lending activities of 30 various Federal agencies, both corporate and noncorporate.

In view of the current demand for retrenchment and economy in all fields of Government activity, it appears evident from the study that the lending activities should be scrutinized by the Congress with a view toward curtailing programs wherever possible and liquidating nonessential loans with the thought of applying the receipts as a reduction of the public debt or to the general cost of government.

Tables and statistical data on Federal loans covering the period of 1934 to 1948, which the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures requested and received from the agencies of the Government, will be transmitted to the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate as an aid in their respective deliberations to curtail, if necessary, the operating budgets and the lending activities of each agency making Government loans.

At the same time this report is designed to assist other committees and individual Members of the Congress in their deliberations with respect to the liquidation or the reincorporation of corporate lending agencies by June 30, 1948, under the provision of the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 597).

In addition, the study serves the dual purpose of revealing factual data concerning the noncorporate lending agencies of the Federal Government while showing the urgent need for retrenchment in all phases of Federal lending activity.

Detailed information on loans made is available through June 30, 1946. This data shows the type of loan or purpose for which made, by agency and the fiscal status of the loans as of the above date with the exception of RFC and its subsidiaries which is as of March 31, 1947.

Of the $47,584,589,258 total of direct loans made by 27 agencies, there is principal outstanding of $5,882,996,197. Cash repayments amount to $32,885,379,283; renewals, $6,588,025,813; charge-offs, $420,409,081; losses incurred on collateral sold on foreclosed loans $191,534,346; and other credits to principal $1,616,244,536. Principal and interest in default as of June 30, 1946, amount to $365,774,089.

In addition to this, three agencies have guaranteed lending activities. The Veterans' Administration has a loan-guaranty program that involves over $10,000,000,000 including the estimates for fiscal years 1947 and 1948. On this amount there is a contingent Government liability of almost $5,000,000,000. The Navy Department has a total disbursement of over $2,750,000,000 in guaranteed loans with an estimated loss of $1,200,000. The War Department has a loan program of various guaranteed and other loans in the amount of $32,657,441,012, with a principal outstanding of $465,151,785.

The tremendous total of funds used for domestic lending is further augmented by loans made to foreign governments and entities. The Export-Import Bank of Washington has a total of actual and estimated loans of this nature through 1948, of $2,942,044,040. The cumulative total of the loans made through June 30, 1946, is $987,444,040. Of this amount there is a principal outstanding of $722,772,866. The Treasury Department through the fiscal year of 1947 extended a line of credit to the United Kingdom in the amount of $1,500,000,000 and estimates $1,900,000,000 for expenditures in fiscal year 1948. Other foreign loans which were made to Greece, Turkey, China, and Great Britain total $600,000,000.

Further data is reported in the form of factual information relating to loan purposes, interest rates, terms of loans, and collateral or securities required by each Federal lending agency, so that the Appropriations Committees and other appropriate committees and the Members of the Congress may have complete information on all of the lending functions of the Federal Government.

Submission of the previous study may be noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 28, 1947, page 5917. Since the previous study was referred by the President to the Appropriations Committee, it is respectfully requested that this supplement be referred to both the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Banking and Currency for their information, and printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations; and, without objection, a copy of the report will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Abe Murdock, of Utah, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years;

J. Copeland Gray, of New York, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 2 years;

Robert N. Denham, of Maryland, to be general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years; and

William O. Boss and Martin M. Cummings, for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. Edward Sedley Bres, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. MURRAY introduced Senate bill 1740, to encourage the flow of capital into small and intermediate sized independent business enterprises and to promote the development of such enterprises by the establishment of a permanent Federal Small Business Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MYERS introduced Senate bill 1741, to continue rent control until February 28, 1949, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

FEDERAL SMALL BUSINESS CORPORATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the establishment of a permanent Federal Small Business Corporation, and I request that a statement by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement of the Senator from Montana will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1740) to encourage the flow of capital into small and intermediate sized independent enterprises and to promote the development of such enterprises by the establishment of a permanent Federal Small Business Corporation, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

If there is any Member of this Congress who has failed to express his anxiety for the preservation of our system of small business, I am unable to name him. Yet, in session after session of the Congress well-conceived legislation, designed to aid American small business, is permitted to die a quiet death in committee or expire on the Senate calendar.

American small business has always been the first to feel the effects of an impending recession and the last to benefit from good times. We know that during the last depression the corporate giants of American monopoly industries came through virtually unscathed, while hundreds of thousands of independent small businesses fell by the wayside.

We know that reliance on the criminal and civil sanctions of our antitrust laws has not been enough to prevent the steady and increasing absorption of American industry into fewer and fewer large-scale corporations. We know that the negative legalistic antitrust approach is ineffective, particularly when year after year we see the Congress denying adequate appropriations to the Justice Department's Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission. One of the last reports issued by the Small Business Committee under my chairmanship revealed that following World War II the largest 250 American corporations acquired control of 67 percent of the total industrial capacity of the United States. These mergers, particularly where the merging corporations are large organizations, are accelerating the growth of monopoly at a dangerous rate.

If Congress really seeks to preserve small business, then, in addition to recognizing the need of enforcement of antimonopoly laws, it must recognize that the time has come to provide certain affirmative aids to small business. If Congress is to prevent a further decline of the role of independent small business in our economy, if Congress is to preserve the competitive free-enterprise system, then it must, in addition to providing for a genuine and vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, provide specific and positive aid to small business that will help it to overcome some of the artificial and arbitrary handicaps it suffers as a result of the monopoly control of the American economy.

Mr. President, I am sending to the desk a bill establishing a Federal small-business corporation which will have specific authority and responsibility to aid small business in three major fields: (1) by providing for the financing of small and medium sized businesses by making available loan capital and equity capital for terms from 1 to 10 years; (2) by providing a program of Government insurance of exports; (3) by providing for review of all Government contracts to insure that the terms of such contracts do not unreasonably discriminate against small business.

Legislation covering one or another of these three fields has been introduced in recent sessions of Congress by able Senators. I have felt it desirable, even necessary, to consolidate in one Government agency the three basic operating functions which can help small business overcome the artificial barriers it faces.

For the purpose of its loans, guaranties, and purchases of preferred stock, the Corporation will be given a capital stock of $125,000,000, subscribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. It may have outstanding obligations up to $1,000,000,000. No loan, purchase, or guaranty for any one business may exceed $250,000. Of the total loans outstanding at any one time, at least 50 percent must be concentrated in the really small loans and purchases, by virtue of the limitation which provides that at least 50 percent of the total funds outstanding must be invested in loans which aggregate not more than $50,000 for any one concern. The loans or purchases may be made either directly or through commercial banks which may thereafter rediscount or resell to the Corporation.

The recent report of the Committee for Economic Development on the special problems of small business confirms that small business has increasing difficulty in obtaining financing as the requirements move from short-term to long-term loans. The most serious financing problem for small business is adequate permanent or equity capital. And notoriously, small businesses in the South and the West have had to pay interest rates far higher than the national average. Finally, the commercial banks are more inclined to fail small business in times of stress when it is most in need of credit assistance. This bill provides the kind of long-term consistent financing which, under a national policy of aiding small business, will help to level out the exaggerated peaks and valleys of the business cycle for small business.

In the export field thousands of small American manufacturers are denied adequate opportunity for participation because they cannot compete with foreign rivals who are backed by their government export insurance or because the American manufacturer has inadequate capital to provide the longer credit terms offered by foreign exporters.

Title 3 of the bill would establish a foreign-trade insurance division in the Corporation which would have the same responsibilities and functions as those set out in an earlier bill introduced by Senator PEPPER and myself, S. 414.

Finally, the Corporation is given authority to review all Government bids and contract offers from the standpoint of determining whether the terms or the size of the individual bids unnecessarily discriminate against small business enterprise. Where such discrimination is found, the Corporation is authorized to recommend to the agency involved and to the President a new form of contract which would provide fair opportunity to small business to participate.

Mr. President, this Congress, despite the fact that its members individually pay lip service to small business, has failed to provide a single piece of legislation which could be fairly called antimonopoly or pro small business. The American people will not be deceived by mere protestations of friendship for small business. Small business will answer in words like those of Emerson: "I cannot hear what you say because the things you do to the contrary thunder in my ear."

The bill I introduce today represents the crystallization of studies conducted by a number of Senators over the years. It represents a real opportunity for this Congress to do something for the preservation of the competitive free-enterprise system.

CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to continue rent control until February 28, 1949, and I request that it be printed in full in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1741) to continue rent control until February 28, 1949, introduced by Mr. Myers, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of title II of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 and all regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder shall be continued until February 28, 1949; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred, prior to such termination date, the provisions of this title and such regulations, orders, and requirements shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense.

SEC. 2. Section 201 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Congress, however, recognizes that an emergency exists and that the statement and purposes set forth in section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, are still applicable with respect to rents for housing accommodations. The Congress, therefore, finds that it is necessary to impose certain restrictions with reference to housing accommodations as hereinafter set forth."

SEC. 3. Section 202 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 202. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or a legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing.

"(b) The term 'housing accommodations' means any building, structure, or part thereof, or land appurtenant thereto, or any other real or personal property rented or offered for rent for living or dwelling purposes (including houses, apartments, rooming-, or boarding-house accommodations, and other prop-

erties used for living or dwelling purposes) together with all privileges, services, furnishings, furniture, and facilities connected with the use or occupancy of such property.

"(c) The term 'defense-rental area' means any part of any area in which rents were regulated on February 29, 1948, under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and any areas hereinafter designated and placed under regulation pursuant to the authority of this act, as amended.

"(d) The term 'rent' means the consideration, including any bonus, benefit, or gratuity demanded or received for or in connection with the use or occupancy of housing accommodations, or the transfer of a lease or such accommodations.

"(e) The term 'maximum rent' means the maximum lawful rent for the use of defense-area housing accommodations.

"(f) The term 'defense-area housing accommodations' means housing accommodations within any defense-rental area.

"(g) The term 'documents' includes records, books, accounts, correspondence, memoranda, and other documents, and drafts and copies of any of the foregoing.

"(h) The term 'district court' means any district court of the United States, and the United States Court for any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and the term 'circuits courts of appeals' includes the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, is amended as follows:

"SEC. 204. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter, such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, by regulation or order, establish such maximum rent or maximum rents for any housing accommodations in a designated defense-rental area as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this act, making due allowance for appropriate adjustments in cases where a maximum rent for a housing accommodation was established under a lease executed pursuant to section 204 (b) of the act on or before December 31, 1947, and in cases of housing accommodations, the construction of which was completed on or after February 1, 1947, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion on or after February 1, 1947. So far as practicable, in establishing any maximum rent for any defense-area housing accommodations, the Housing Expediter shall ascertain and give due consideration to the rents prevailing for such accommodations, or comparable accommodations, on or about April 1, 1941 (or, if prior or subsequent to April 1, 1941, defense activities shall have resulted or threatened to result in increases in rents for housing accommodations in such area inconsistent with the purposes of this act, then on or about a date (not earlier than April 1, 1940), which in the judgment of the Housing Expediter does not reflect such increases), and he shall make adjustments for such relevant factors as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability in respect of such accommodations, including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs within such defense-rental area. In designating defense-rental areas, in prescribing regulations and orders establishing maximum rents for such accommodations, and in selecting persons to administer such regulations and orders, the Housing Expediter shall, to such extent as he determines to be practicable, consider any recommendations which may be made by State and local officials concerned with housing or rental conditions in any defense-rental area. Whenever the Housing Expediter shall find that, in any defense-rental area or any portion thereof specified by him, the availability of adequate rental housing accommodations and other relevant factors are such as to make rent control unnecessary for the purpose of eliminating speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in rents and of preventing profiteering, and speculative and other disruptive practices resulting from abnormal market conditions caused by congestion, the controls imposed upon rents by authority of this act in such defense-rental area or portion thereof shall be forthwith abolished; but whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter it is necessary or proper, in order to effectuate the purpose of this act, to reestablish the regulation of rents in any such defense-rental area or portion thereof, he may forthwith by regulation or order reestablish maximum rents for housing accommodations therein in accordance with the standards set forth in this act.

"Any regulation or order under this section may be established in such form and manner, may contain such classifications and differentiations, and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions, as in the judgment of the Housing Expediter are necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act. Any regulation or order under this section which establishes a maximum rent may provide for a maximum rent below the rent or rents prevailing for the defense-area housing accommodations, at the time of the issuance of such regulation or order.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit speculative or manipulative practices or renting or leasing practices (including practices relating to recovery of the possession) in connection with any defense-area housing accommodations, which in his judgment are equivalent to or are likely to result in rent increases inconsistent with the purposes of this act.

"(c) Regulations, orders, and requirements under this act may contain such provisions as the Housing Expediter deems necessary to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof.

"(d) The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in established rental practices, except where such action is affirmatively found by the Housing Expediter to be necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, or requirement under this act.

"(e) The Housing Expediter shall administer the powers, functions, and duties under this act; and for the purpose of exercising such powers, functions, and duties, the Office of Housing Expediter is hereby extended until February 28, 1949.

"(f) During the period beginning on the effective date of this title and ending on the date this title ceases to be in effect, no person shall demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any housing accommodations greater than the maximum rent in effect on February 29, 1948, established under the authority of this act.

"(g) The Housing Expediter is authorized to issue such regulations and orders as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and shall by regulation or order make such adjustments in maximum rents as may be necessary to correct inequities or further to carry out the purposes and provisions of this title.

"(h) 1. The Housing Expediter is hereby authorized and directed to create in each defense-rental area, or such portion thereof as he may designate, a local advisory board, each such board to consist of not less than five members who are representative citizens of the area, to be appointed by the Housing Expediter from recommendations made by the respective governors. The local boards may make such recommendations to the Housing Expediter as they deem advisable with respect to the following matters:

"(A) Decontrol of defense-rental area or any portion thereof;

"(B) The adequacy of the general rent level in the area; and

"(C) Operations generally of the local rent office.

"2. The Housing Expediter shall furnish the local boards suitable office space and stenographic assistance and shall make available to such boards any records and other information in the possession of the Housing Expediter with respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents for housing accommodations in the respective defense-rental areas which may be requested by such boards.

"3. Any recommendation of a local board which in the judgment of the Housing Expediter is appropriately substantiated and in accordance with applicable law, shall be approved and appropriate action shall promptly be taken to carry such recommendation into effect."

SEC. 5. Section 205 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 205. (a) The Housing Expediter may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Housing Expediter may utilize the services of Federal, State, and local agencies and may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Housing Expediter in any case in any court. In the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of the Office of Housing Expediter, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

"(b) The principal office of the Housing Expediter shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place.

"(c) The Housing Expediter is authorized to make such studies and investigations, to conduct such hearings, and to obtain such information as he deems necessary or proper to assist him in prescribing any regulation or order under this act, or in the administration and enforcement of this act and regulations thereunder.

"(d) The Housing Expediter is further authorized, by regulation or order, to require any person who rents or offers for rent or acts as broker or agent for the rental of any housing accommodations, to furnish any such information under oath or affirmation or otherwise, to make and keep records and other documents, and to make reports, and he may require any such person to permit the inspection and copying of records and other documents, and the inspection of defense-area housing accommodations. The Housing Expediter may administer oaths and affirmations and may, whenever necessary, by subpena require any such person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any designated place.

"(e) For the purpose of obtaining any information under subsection (c) the Housing Expediter may by subpena require any other person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any designated place.

"(f) The production of a person's documents at any place other than his place of business shall not be required under this section in any case in which, prior to the return date specified in the subpena issued with respect thereto, such person either has furnished the Housing Expediter with a copy of such documents (certified by such person under oath to be a true and correct copy), or has entered into a stipulation with the Housing Expediter as to the information contained in such documents.

"(g) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon, any person referred to in subsection (e), the district court for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Housing Expediter, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to any person referred to in subsection (d).

"(h) Witnesses subpenaed under this section shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

"(i) No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 49, sec. 46) shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege

"(j) The Housing Expediter shall not publish or disclose any information obtained under this act that such Housing Expediter deems confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless he determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the public interest.

"(k) Any person subpenaed under this section shall have the right to make a record of his testimony and to be represented by counsel.

"(l) At any time after the issuance of any regulation or order under section 204, any person subject to any provision of such regulation or order, may, in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Housing Expediter, file a protest specifically setting forth objections to any such provision and affidavits or other written evidence in support of such objections. Statements in support of any such regulation or order may be received and incorporated in the transcript of the proceedings at such times and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Housing Expediter. Within a reasonable time after the filing of any protest under this subsection, but in no event more than 30 days after such filing, the Housing Expediter shall either grant or deny such protest in whole or in part, notice such protest for hearing, or provide an opportunity to present further evidence in connection therewith. In the event that the Housing Expediter denies any such protest in whole or in part, he shall inform the protestant of the grounds upon which such decision is based, and of any economic data and other facts of which the Housing Expediter has taken official notice.

"(m) In the administration of this act the Housing Expediter may take official notice of economic data and other facts, including facts found by him as a result of action taken under subsections (c) to (l) of this section.

"(n) Any proceedings under this section may be limited by the Housing Expediter to the filing of affidavits, or other written evidence, and the filing of briefs.

"(o) Any protest filed under this section shall be granted or denied by the Housing Expediter, or granted in part and the remainder of it denied, within a reasonable time after it is filed. Any protestant who is aggrieved by undue delay on the part of the Housing Expediter in disposing of his protest may petition the Emergency Court of Appeals, created pursuant to this section for relief; and such court shall have jurisdiction by appropriate order to require the Housing Expediter to dispose of such protest within such time as may be fixed by the court. If the Housing Expediter does not act finally within the time fixed by the court, the protest shall be deemed to be denied at the expiration of that period.

"(p) Any person who is aggrieved by the denial or partial denial of his protest may, within 30 days after such denial, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals, created pursuant to this section, specifying his objections and praying that the regulation or order protested be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such complaint shall forthwith be served on the Housing Expediter, who shall certify and file with such court a transcript of such portions of the proceedings in connection with the protest as are material under the complaint. Such transcript shall include a statement setting forth, so far as practicable, the economic data and other facts of which the Housing Expediter has taken official notice. Upon the filing of such complaint the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to set aside such regulation or order, in whole or in part, to dismiss the complaint, or to remand the proceeding: *Provided*, That the regulation or order may be modified or rescinded by the Housing Expediter at any time notwithstanding the pendency of such complaint. No objection to such regulation or order, and no evidence in support of any objection thereto, shall be considered by the court, unless such objection shall have been set forth by the complainant in the protest or such evidence shall be contained in the transcript. If application is made to the court by either party for leave to introduce additional evidence which was either offered to the Housing Expediter and not admitted, or which could not reasonably have been offered to the Housing Expediter or included by the Housing Expediter in such proceedings, and the court determines that such evidence should be admitted, the court shall order the evidence to be presented to the Housing Expediter. The Housing Expediter shall promptly receive the same, and such other evidence as he deems necessary or proper, and thereupon he shall certify and file with the court a transcript thereof and any modification made in the regulation or order as a result thereof; except that on request by the Housing Expediter, any such evidence shall be presented directly to the court.

"(q) No such regulation or order shall be enjoined or set aside, in whole or in part, unless the complainant establishes to the satisfaction of the court that the regulation or order is not in accordance with law, or is arbitrary or capricious. The effectiveness of a judgment of the court enjoining or setting aside, in whole or in part, any such regulation or order, shall be postponed until the expiration of 30 days from the entry thereof, except that if a petition for a writ of certiorari is filed with the Supreme Court under subsection (s) within such 30 days, effectiveness of such judgment shall be postponed until an order of the Supreme Court denying such petition becomes final, or until other final disposition of the case by the Supreme Court.

"(r) There is hereby created a court of the United States to be known as the Emergency Court of Appeals, which shall consist of three or more judges to be designated by the Chief Justice of the United States from judges of the United States district courts and circuit courts of appeals. The Chief Justice of the United States shall designate one of such judges as chief judge of the Emergency Court of Appeals, and may, from time to time, designate additional judges for such court and revoke previous designations. The chief judge may, from time to time, divide the court into divisions of three or more members, and any such division may render judgment as the judgment of the court. Two judges shall constitute a quorum of the court and each division thereof. The court shall have the powers of a district court with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this act; except that the court shall not have power to issue any temporary restraining order or interlocutory decree staying or restraining, in whole or in part, the effectiveness of any regulation or order issued under section 204. The court shall exercise its powers and prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases of which it has jurisdiction under this act. The court may fix and establish a table of costs and fees to be approved by the Supreme Court of the United States, but the costs and fees so fixed shall not exceed with respect to any item the costs and fees charged in the Supreme Court of the United States. The court shall have a seal, hold sessions at such places as it may specify, and appoint a clerk and such other employees as it deems necessary or proper.

"(s) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a circuit court of appeals, as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 347). The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Emergency Court of Appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any regulation or order issued under section 204, and of any provision of any such regulation or order. Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal, State, or Territorial, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation or order, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this act authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or any provision of any such regulation or order, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

"(t) (1) Within 30 days after arraignment, or such additional time as the court may allow for good cause shown, in any criminal proceeding, and within 5 days after judgment in any civil or criminal proceeding, brought pursuant to subsections (u) to (y) of this section or section 37 of the Criminal Code, involving alleged violation of any provision of any regulation or order issued under section 204, the defendant may apply to the court in which the proceeding is pending for leave to file in the Emergency Court of Appeals a complaint against the Housing Expediter setting forth objections to the validity of any provision which the defendant is alleged to have violated or conspired to violate. The court in which the proceeding is pending shall grant such leave with respect to any objection which it finds is made in good faith and with respect to which it finds there is reasonable and substantial excuse for the defendant's failure to present such objection in a protest filed in accordance with subsection (L) of this section. Upon the filing of a complaint pursuant to and within 30 days from the granting of such leave, the Emergency Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside in whole or in part the provision of the regulation or order complained of or to dismiss the complaint. The court may authorize the introduction of evidence, either to the Housing Expediter or directly to the court, in accordance with subsection (p) of this section. The provisions of subsections (q), (r), and (s) of this section shall be applicable with respect to any proceeding instituted in accordance with this subsection.

"(2) In any proceeding brought pursuant to subsection (u) to (y) of this section 37

of the Criminal Code, involving an alleged violation of any provision of any such regulation or order, the court shall stay the proceeding—

"(i) during the period within which a complaint may be filed in the Emergency Court of Appeals pursuant to leave granted under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision;

"(ii) during the pendency of any protest properly filed by the defendant under subsection (l) of this section prior to the institution of the proceeding under subsection (u) to (n) of this section or section 37 of the Criminal Code, setting forth objections to validity of such provision which the court finds to have been made in good faith; and

"(iii) during the pendency of any judicial proceeding instituted by the defendant under this section with respect to such protest or instituted by the defendant under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision, and until the expiration of the time allowed in this section for the taking of further proceedings with respect thereto.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, stays shall be granted thereunder in civil proceedings only after judgment and upon application made within 5 days after judgment. Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, in the case of a proceeding under subsection (u) of this section the court granting a stay under this paragraph shall issue a temporary injunction or restraining order enjoining or restraining, during the period of the stay, violations by the defendant of any provision of the regulation or order involved in the proceeding. If any provision of a regulation or order is determined to be invalid by judgment of the Emergency Court of Appeals which has become effective in accordance with subsection (q) of this section any proceeding pending in any court shall be dismissed, and any judgment in such proceeding vacated, to the extent that such proceeding or judgment is based upon violation of such provision. Except as provided in this subsection, the pendency of any protest under subsection (1) of this section, or judicial proceeding under this section, shall not be grounds for staying any proceeding brought pursuant to subsections (u) to (n) of this section or section 37 of the Criminal Code; nor except as provided in this subsection, shall any retroactive effect be given to any judgment setting aside a provision of a regulation or order issued under section 204.

"(u) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of section 206 of this act, he may make application to the appropriate court for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a showing by the Housing Expediter that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

"(v) Any person who willfully violates any provision of section 206 of this act, and any person who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed under section 204 of this act or subsections (c) to (i) of this section, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 2 years in the case of a violation of section 206 (c) and for not more than 1 year in all other cases, or to both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever the Housing Expediter has reason to believe that any person is liable for punishment under this subsection, he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

"(w) The district courts shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violations of section 206 of this act, and, concurrently with State and Territorial courts, of all other proceedings under subsections (u) to (y) of this section. Such criminal proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Such other proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred, and may also be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found: *Provided, however,* That all suits under subsection (y) of this section shall be brought in the district or county in which the defendant resides or has a place of business, an office, or an agent. Any such court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of any criminal or other proceedings brought before it under this section. No costs shall be assessed against the Housing Expediter or the United States Government in any proceeding under this act.

"(x) No person shall be liable for damages or penalties in any Federal, State, or Territorial court, on any grounds for or in respect of anything done or omitted to be done in good faith pursuant to any provision of this act or any regulation, order or requirement thereunder notwithstanding that subsequently such provision, regulation, order or requirement may be modified, rescinded, or determined to be invalid. In any suit or action wherein a party relies for ground of relief or defense upon this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, the court having jurisdiction of such suit or action shall certify such fact to the Housing Expeditor. The Housing Expediter may intervene in any such suit or action.

"(y) Any person who demands, accepts, or receives any payment of rent in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204 shall be liable to the person from whom he demands, accepts, or receives such payment, for reasonable attorney's fees and costs as determined by the court, plus liquidated damages in the amount of (1) $50, or (2) three times the amount by which the payment or payments demanded, accepted, or received exceed the maximum rent which could lawfully be demanded, accepted, or received, whichever in either case may be the greater amount: *Provided,* That the amount of such liquidated damages shall be the amount of the overcharge or overcharges if the defendant proves that the violation was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation. Suit to recover such amount may be brought in any Federal, State, or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction within 1 year after the date of such violation: *Provided further,* That if the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received, either fails to institute an action under this subsection within 30 days from the date of the occurrence of the violation or is not entitled for any reason to bring the action, the Housing Expediter may institute such action on behalf of the United States within such 1-year period. If such action is instituted by the Housing Expediter, the buyer shall thereafter be barred from bringing an action for the same violation or violations."

SEC. 6. Section 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"PROHIBITIONS

"SEC. 206. (a) It shall be unlawful, regardless of any contract, agreement, lease, or other obligation heretofore or hereafter entered into, for any person to demand, accept, or receive any rent for any defense-area housing accommodations or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of any regulation or order or agreement under this act, or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to do any of the foregoing.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to remove or attempt to remove from any defense-area housing accommodations the tenant or occupant thereof or to refuse to renew the lease or agreement for the use of such accommodations, because such tenant or occupant has taken, or proposes to take, action authorized or required by this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the Government, or for any adviser or consultant to the Housing Expediter in his official capacity, to disclose, otherwise than in the course of official duty, any information obtained under this act, or to use any such information, for personal benefit.

"(d) Nothing in this act shall be construed to require any person to offer any accommodations for rent."

SEC. 7. Section 209 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. Section 210 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 210. Section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after "Selective Training and Service Act of 1940;" the following: "Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended;"

SEC. 9. Section 211 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 211. (a) The provisions of this title shall be applicable to the several States and to the Territories and possessions of the United States but shall not be applicable to the District of Columbia.

"(b) The provisions of this title shall not apply to housing accommodations located in any transient hotel, motor court, or in any tourist home serving transient guests, exclusively.

SEC. 10. This act shall become effective on the 1st day of March 1948.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 11. This act may be cited at the Housing and Rent Extension Act of 1948.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM TO FILE INTERIM REPORTS

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and I request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received. The clerk will report it for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program be authorized to file additional reports with the Secretary of the Senate following the adjournment of the Senate and that they be printed as parts of Senate Report No. 440.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what is the reason for the adoption of this resolution? And if it is adopted, when would the committee expect to make a report to the Secretary of the Senate?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it has been the custom to make what are called interim reports from time to time, and then an annual report. It has been

found to be much more appropriate to have the reports coming in, one a month or one every 2 months, rather than wait for the conclusion. This would permit the issuance of reports and their printing.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have the resolution go over for the time being. Perhaps the Senator and I will get together. I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over temporarily.

The resolution (S. Res. 160) was ordered to lie over temporarily.

Subsequently, the resolution (S. Res. 160), submitted by Mr. BREWSTER, was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF REGULATION OF CONSUMER CREDIT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CAPEHART submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, 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 amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That after November 1, 1947, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 8843, and no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised after such date except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title.

HOMER CAPEHART,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

REPORT OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Appropriations House bill 4347, the second supplemental appropriation bill with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received for the calendar.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL-FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL—AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] in charge of the conference on the War Department civil-functions appropriation bill may be authorized to file a conference report while the Senate is in recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

REPORT ON POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Civil Service Committee, having charge of post offices, I am pleased to make the following report showing the present status of postmaster nominations:

Number of postmaster nominations received by Senate Civil Service Committee since Jan. 1, 1947	1,285
Withdrawals	116
Nominations to be considered	1,169
Nominations recommended for confirmation	904
Nominations held up for investigation	137
Nominations held by Senators	100

(Of these 100, 20 are also being held by the committee for investigation.)

Nominations received July 24 and not examined	28
Unconfirmed nominations	245

Of 245 unconfirmed nominations, 137 are held for investigation. One hundred nominations held up by Senators of respective States.

Mr. President, I want to say to every Senator upon the floor, if there is a nomination being held up, if the Senator will come to the office of the Committee on Civil Service, the entire file will be turned over to him. It is the position of the Civil Service Committee that every Senator is entitled to see the file on any particular case.

NOMINATION OF HERBERT W. CHRISTENBERRY—SUSPENSION OF THE RULE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that paragraph 6 of rule XXXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to proceedings on nominations, be suspended with respect to the nomination of Herbert W. Christenberry to be district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana, now pending in the Committee on the Judiciary. I wish to say that the rule provides that if any nomination is before the Committee on the Judiciary after the Senate recesses it automatically dies after 30 days. The reason for this move on my part is that the subcommittee has not had time to investigate the matter, with no reflection on Mr. Christenberry, and my motion is agreeable to the Committee on the Judiciary and to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's motion is not in order at the present time.

Mr. WILEY. I ask unanimous consent that the rule may be suspended.

Mr. LUCAS. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, is this going to lead to any controversy?

Mr. WILEY. I do not think it will take a minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that paragraph 6 of rule XXXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate be suspended. Is there obpection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

PALESTINE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me respecting Senate Joint Resolution 149, of which I am a cosponsor.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 149

Mr. President, the question of Palestine has been discussed on the floor of the Senate hundreds of times. Again and again various Members of this body have risen to reiterate the sympathy and support of the American people and the Congress of the United States for the aspiration of the Hebrew people to reestablish their nation in Palestine. Again and again we have deplored the tragic plight of the Hebrew people and criticized the British Government for violating its duties and obligations under the League of Nations mandate. Over and over again we have called attention to the responsibility of the mandatory power in Palestine for continuing the tragedy of destitute and desperate millions still confined in German concentration camps, still waiting hopelessly in displaced persons centers, still bereft of property, security, and citizenship in the countries of eastern Europe.

I think that it is time to change this record of futile lamentations and pious hopes. I believe that we must take some positive and constructive action to put an end to the Hebrew tragedy and to the flagrant violation by a government of its obligations under international law.

Permit me to call your attention, Mr. President, to certain simple and incontrovertible facts. There is a treaty between Great Britain and the United States—the Anglo-American Convention of 1924—which was approved and ratified by the United States Senate. This treaty incorporates the text of the mandate assumed by Great Britain in regard to Palestine. It specifically stipulates that the British Government will not make any changes in any provision of this mandate without previous consultation and approval by the United States. Nevertheless, almost from the day that Great Britain signed this treaty it has been guilty of persistent and brazen infractions of the fundamental provisions of the mandate amounting to unilateral denunciation of this treaty.

May I cite some of these infractions?

The mandate instructs the British Government and its Palestine Administration to "encourage close settlement by the Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes." One does not facilitate immigration by passing a law prohibiting it; one does not encourage settlement on the land by passing a law prohibiting the purchase of that land.

This international contract assumed by Great Britain and incorporated in the Anglo-American Convention also provides that "the mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home." For 25 years the British Colonial Office and the Palestine Administration have, both openly and secretly, maneuvered and connived to create such conditions as would

make the establishment of a Jewish national home impossible.

Article 5 of the mandate states: "The mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that no Palestine territory shall be ceded or leased to, or in any way placed under the control of, the government of any foreign power." At the very time this article was being written Great Britain made arrangements to partition Palestine, placing three-quarters of that country under the rule of the foreign puppet, Emir Abdullah. In January 1946 the last shreds of legality were torn from this provision of the mandate by the action of the British Government in unilaterally establishing Trans-Jordan as an independent kingdom. During the 24 years that Great Britain kept Trans-Jordan apart from the rest of Palestine, meanwhile sustaining it by the revenues from the Palestine treasury (87 percent of which were derived by exorbitant taxation of the Hebrew people) the Palestine administration prohibited Hebrews from settling in Trans-Jordan, from acquiring land there, even from traversing that country without the special permission of the High Commission.

In article 9 of the mandate the British Government is made responsible "for seeing that the judicial system established in Palestine shall assure to foreigners, as well as to natives, a complete guaranty of their rights." With the exception of Hitler's attitude toward treaties as "scraps of paper," I know no more cynical disregard of a solemn contractual obligation than the British violation of this provision. Since the war, all due processes of law and justice have been abrogated in Palestine by the British Government. Military courts have been instituted which have repeatedly meted out cruel and unusual punishments to the Hebrew people, punishments that are in striking contrast to the sentences given to Arabs for the same offenses. For years, thousands of Hebrews have been arrested, imprisoned, and deported to concentration camps in Africa without trial, without even preferment of charges.

Article 15 of the mandate specifically states: "No discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion, or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of his religious belief." The legislative violations I have cited above and the thousands of incontrovertible instances of judicial, administrative, and economic discrimination that I can cite prove that British policy deliberately contradicts this provision of the mandate.

If in the face of this overwhelming evidence the United States Government allows these conditions to continue, it will be guilty of dereliction of its rights and responsibilities under the Anglo-American Convention. We must not allow it. We must not permit the British Government, nor any Government, to show such brazen disrespect for a treaty to which the United States is a party. We cannot tolerate such an affront to the American Government and the American people. We cannot condone such oppression of a small and weak nation for whose welfare we have legally and morally assumed responsibility. We cannot shut our eyes to such flouting of international law and of decent respect to the opinions of mankind without destroying the faith of millions of people in justice and decency, without letting loose upon this world an area of international brigandage and oppression like the one which has just cost us a bloody world war.

Mr. President, I have taken the time of the Senate to make this statement because we have recently learned that the death sentence to three young Hebrew patriots, imposed by one of these illegal military courts, has been confirmed by General MacMillan, the commander in chief of the British Army of Occupation in Palestine. This was done in the face of a fervent plea made by the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine for the commutation of these death sentences. It was done within a week of the time when the British commanding general in Italy commuted the death sentences of the three German generals responsible for the brutal massacre of 335 Italians in Rome. I am sure the Senate will agree with me that we cannot permit this gross miscarriage of justice without entering our vigorous protest in the RECORD and communicating it to the British Government unless we are prepared to have in Palestine a repetition of the official murders that blacken the pages of Irish history. The Senators will recall that until an outraged American Government gave expression to its abhorrence and indignation, the British hanged and shot hundreds of Irish patriots. We must not allow that many victims to the Moloch of British oppression in Palestine before we take action.

Mr. President, recently the Secretary of State announced that the policy of the American Government on Palestine has not changed. We know what that policy has been. I urge the Senate to call upon the Secretary of State to implement this policy immediately by insisting, as we have every right to do, that Great Britain live up to its treaty with the United States and reestablish immediately a civilian administration in Palestine which will guarantee the civil liberties of the population and carry out in full the provisions of the mandate. Such is the purpose of the Senate Joint Resolution 149 of which I am a cosponsor.

PURCHASES OF GRAIN FOR EXPORT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the interest of saving time, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a short statement I am making on a bill recently before the Senate, Senate bill 1586, relating to exports of grain and grain products.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HUGH BUTLER

There is pending at the present time a bill, S. 1586, which provides that the sale to foreign purchasers of grain and grain products for export shall not be performed or conducted by a department or agency of the Government. A number of considerations prompted me to introduce that bill. I am convinced that the sale of grain for export can be handled in an efficient and orderly manner by the grain trade and I wish to eliminate, as quickly as possible, Government interference and competition with private business. It is my belief that no Government agency can enter the market without being an unsettling influence.

It was my hope that Government competition with private business could be eliminated without specific directives from Congress. I recognize that in certain activities the withdrawal of the Government must be a gradual process. I feel that this should be accomplished by the various agencies as expeditiously as conditions confronting them permit. I am happy to report that a spokesman for the Department of Agriculture last week stated, and I quote:

"During the war we have been criticized by some businessmen for the large degree of Government activity in fields once reserved for private business. I assure you that we are as anxious to get out of most of these functions as businessmen are to have us out.

"In the development of export programs for cotton our major emphasis now is to get this business into the hands of private traders. That is not easy with the world's economy so disrupted and much of the foreign buying being done by governments. But we are making progress. Last year about a third of the three-million-odd bales of cotton exported were handled by private concerns in this country. Next year we believe the figure will be much nearer 100 percent."

It appears that the Government some time ago returned the sale of coal for export to the private coal trade. I wish to call the Senate's attention to a report on coal exports released by the President last Saturday. This report was made by Capt. Granville Conway, Coordinator for Emergency Export Programs, who is assigned the task of coordinating all efforts to transport grain and coal to meet urgent needs abroad. In his report Captain Conway states, and I quote:

"A notable aspect of the past year's coal export program has been the general shift from United States Government procurement of export coal to direct purchasing from United States industry by foreign buying agencies. This transition was accomplished gradually during the year with a minimum disruption of the flow of exports.

"Virtually all shipments are now on this direct-purchase basis. United States Government agencies act only to coordinate the planning, scheduling, and movement of supplies to avoid overcrowding in the ports and to assure an equitable division of the supplies available for export among the countries receiving the coal."

In commenting on this report the Honorable John R. Steelman, the assistant to the President, stated, and I quote:

"It is gratifying, therefore, that the United States in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, was able to ship abroad—and to the places where it was most gravely needed—record-breaking amounts of coal, and to do this in spite of production and shipping difficulties, without denying the needs of American consumers and industry. This record was made with a minimum of Government participation and controls, through the cooperative efforts of the industries concerned, working under policies and programs set by the Government."

It is significant that Captain Conway, who has so successfully coordinated transportation, recommended to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary when the bill, now Public Law 188, was being considered that the grain trade could assume the responsibility for the sale of grain for export to foreign purchasers and could exercise it more efficiently than the Government. He is not the only administration spokesman who favored the return of this trade to private firms. C. Tyler Wood, economic advisor to the State Department, advised the subcommittee that heard witnesses on the question of continuing export controls, that he personally saw no reason why grain export should not be the function of private industry.

I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture should follow the recommendations of Captain Conway and Mr. Wood. I hope that before the Congress adjourns we may learn that, as with cotton, a major emphasis in the grain export program will be on the return of the grain exporting business to private trade. The private grain export trade, in a letter sent by R. J. Barnes, the association president, to President Truman on July 21, expressed again its desire and ability to undertake this business and stated in part, and I quote:

"Being interested, as you are, in the level of prices, you must have noticed during the last few weeks the steep advance in prices of grain. In no small measure this has been brought about by the buying of wheat for the export program by Government agencies such as the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture. It is true, of course, if the export of wheat was handled by the grain trade and if the export program is to be executed in the same volume, the export grain trade will have to buy and sell to claimant nations the same amount of wheat as is being bought for them by the Department of Agriculture. However,

the Department of Agriculture, for various reasons, is attempting to execute its export program under the great handicaps of operating in the open and in full view, and with the publicity attached thereto of the knowledge of its operations by the general public, which overemphasizes the importance of the purchases made by the Production and Marketing Administration. If the exports were handled by the private grain trade the result would be greatly less disturbing to our general economy, and, incidentally, foreign claimant nations would purchase their grain on a purely competitive basis, which is not now possible by purchasing from Government agencies within the framework of the allocations.

"We know that you are gravely concerned with these matters and that you have charged the Secretary of Commerce as the head of a representative nonpartisan public committee appointed by you, to investigate the effects upon our domestic economy of the exports contemplated.

"We wish to assure you that the grain exporters of the United States are fully capable of handling the exports of wheat to claimant nations, and that this can be done more efficiently and more cheaply by us than it is now being done by the Government. As you state in your message, 'It is imperative that these programs of assistance be conceived and executed so as to be of maximum benefit to such foreign countries, without having an unduly adverse effect upon our domestic economy'.

"This, we assure you, will be accomplished exactly by what we urged be done with the least possible delay, namely, the physical handling of the procuring, shipping and exporting, and all the details attached thereto, by the private grain trade under the system of allocations which is provided for under the extension of the Export Control Act."

There seems abundant evidence that Government agencies are retiring from various kinds of business in the export field, yet the Department of Agriculture is holding tenaciously to the export of grain, a field in which even the administration's own coordinator holds that the private trades could do a better job. Though the Congress, hurried in its last few weeks of considering legislation, extended the export control law unchanged in this respect, the Senate's Judiciary Committee in its report recommended that this business be returned to private trade at the earliest moment. It will be interesting to note, when this body again convenes, how far the Government agencies have progressed toward the return of this business to the private trades, and how they interpret that earliest moment.

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD two editorials with reference to Hawaiian statehood, one from the Portland Press Herald and one from the Evening Express, both of Portland, Maine. The editorials do not necessarily express my opinion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of July 3, 1947]

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

When the House voted, last Monday, statehood for Hawaii, Maine's Representatives divided: Mr. HALE and Mrs. SMITH voted for the measure; Mr. FELLOWS voted against it. The total vote was 196 to 133. Of the no votes, 77 were by Democrats, and only 56 were by Republicans. There is a hint there that there was some partisanship in the result, the Democrats perhaps fearing that admission of Hawaii as a State would strengthen the Republican majorities in House and Senate; and there were, no doubt, some Republicans who, with no particular affection for Hawaii, felt that two more Senators and two more Representatives would be on their side to strengthen their hold upon legislation and general party control.

There was nothing immediate in the vote. The Senate is believed to be rather lukewarm on the subject of Hawaiian statehood, and it is thought that no action will be taken at this session. The arguments for prompt action do not seem overpowering. The chief ones are that granting of statehood would be fulfillment of promises made long ago to grant it when the islands are ready, and that the islands are, in fact, ready for it now.

But opponents, though in the minority, have a strong case. There are many in the islands who are opposed to statehood, and there are more who rebel a little at the thought of two Japanese Senators and two Japanese Representatives in the Congress, as there might be, inasmuch as the Japanese population comprises the most numerous part of the population. There is some sense in the objection that Hawaii would have one Senator for each 35,000 voters, and in the suggestion that it would be an error to admit an insular possession into statehood.

The House would have none of these arguments, however; it seemed to believe that America, the melting pot, would take care of the polyglot population of the islands; and, of course, there was general agreement that during the war the Hawaiians were firmly loyal. Some day statehood will come. The surprise really is that the present House of Representatives should have believed that the time is now.

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express July 5, 1947]

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

The House has passed and sent to the Senate a bill to admit Hawaii to the Union as the forty-ninth State. If the bill becomes law, Hawaii will be our first off-shore State. It will be a long way off shore, 2,000 miles, no less.

The Hawaiian Islands are the main pivot of our defenses in the Pacific. If the Japanese had wrested them from us—and if they had followed up their attack on Pearl Harbor, they might well have done so—we should certainly have been a much longer time in beating Japan to her knees. Now we have the statement of General MacArthur that Japan cannot possibly make war within the next hundred years, and so cannot make the Hawaiians her outpost, as she tried, however, with might and main to do before the war, holding the Japanese for the Emperor, insisting and successfully insisting on Japanese-language schools for these Japanese Americans.

Many of these Japanese Americans are loyal, we do not doubt that. But, all told, out of the Hawaiian population of 500,000, 180,000 are Japanese, and if the Emperor in that swift assault had captured the islands, who supposes that he would have met with very fierce resistance from that bloc of Empire blood? The Japanese are masters in the art of lip-service; they bow very low indeed when they are forced. But in character they are the most homogeneous race in the world. Situations alter, but they do not. They are like tools in a rack; take down one tool or another, and it will equally serve the Emperor's purpose.

The Japanese in the Hawaiians have reached high subordinate positions, but so long as Hawaii is a territory, they can reach no higher. Give her statehood, and the vote will soon show itself. We are seeing that the Japanese on Nippon, while they can be made to go through the motions of democracy, cannot fathom its secret, but when the Emperor, "the guest" comes into the Diet, they bow low, and the indications of the blood come out.

In the Hawaiians the Japanese are still Japanese. Their voting power is a bloc. They don't vote as Democrats or Republicans; another life would be all too short to din these notions into them. They vote as Japanese, to strengthen their tribal position—even though it may well be that they have given up hopes, in this generation, of throwing up their caps for the Emperor. The Chinese-Hawaiian blend is a good blend; the Japanese-Hawaiian decidedly a bad, surly, and often ugly blend. Its traits are Japanese rather than Hawaiian.

Hawaii is the cross-roads of the world, a mixture of every conceivable dark race, with a few white men thrown in. It is too early yet to know which way that cat will jump. It will be better to wait a generation, long enough for the Japanese language to disappear, and by that time perhaps we may be surer of these new citizens. If you understand a man's words, you are at least that much nearer to estimating his thoughts.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATOR MCMAHON AT MEETING OF AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY IN NEW HAVEN, CONN.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show that yesterday when I was announced as being absent on public business I was addressing the Auxiliary of the American Legion at New Haven, Conn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the announcement will be printed in the RECORD.

TRIBUTE TO PENNSYLVANIA—ADDRESS BY HAMILTON DALTON

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hamilton Dalton before the Sunbury Rotary Club at Sunbury, Pa., June 5, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISLOYALTY IN GOVERNMENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD DAILY COURANT

[Mr. MCMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cure Worse Than Disease," from the Hartford Daily Courant of July 23, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PICK-SLOAN PLAN: A WASTEFUL FAILURE—STATEMENT BY BENTON J. STONG

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "The Pick-Sloan Plan—a Wasteful Failure," by Benton J. Stong, delivered at the Valley Development Conference in Washington, D. C., July 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ELECTRICAL INDUSTRY AND MULTIPLE PURPOSE RIVER VALLEY DEVELOPMENT—ADDRESS BY MORRIS L. COOKE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Electrical Industry and Multiple Purpose River Valley Development," by Morris Llewellyn Cooke, consulting engineer of Philadelphia, at the Valley Development Conference, Washington, D. C., July 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLOODS IN THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times entitled "Breadbasket to Desert?" which appears in the Appendix.]

FLOODS AND FLOOD CONTROL—STATEMENT OF JEROME C. LOCKE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding floods and flood control, by Jerome C. Locke, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARSHALL PLAN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Marshall plan by Senator KILGORE, broadcast over the radio July 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him delivered before the Zionist Club at Manhattan Center, New York, July 6, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MALONE

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator MALONE at the convention of the National Editorial Association, Fort Worth, Tex., April 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPENSATION OF LETTER CARRIERS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. UMSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Letter Carriers' Due," from the New York Herald Tribune of July 20, 1947, and an editorial entitled "A Matter of Justice," from the New York Daily Mirror of July 22, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PALESTINE—ADDRESS BY DR. JAMES G. MACDONALD

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Dr James G. MacDonald, member of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine, on the occasion of the Jubilee Convention of the Zionist Organization of America, at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, July 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

VISIT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN TO THE SENATE—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock in the New York Times of July 25, 1947, having to do with the visit of President Truman to the Senate, which appears in the Appendix.]

EVERYBODY'S FOR IT BUT—EDITORIAL FROM THE BISMARCK (N. D.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Everybody's For It But"—published in the Bismarck (N D.) Tribune for July 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

GEORGIA WARM SPRINGS FOUNDATION

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD speeches made on the occasion of the presentation to the State of Georgia of properties of the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McMAHON

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on foreign policy to be delivered by him on July 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMMIGRATION POLICY—ARTICLE BY STANLEY HIGH

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why We Must Modernize Our Immigration Policy," by Stanley High, published in the Reader's Digest for August 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED—PROCEEDINGS OF PUBLIC FORUM

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the proceedings of the American Federation of Physically Handicapped Public Forum, Washington, D. C., June 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALABAMA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, GANTT, ALA.

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Maury A. McWilliams, president of the Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc., dated June 7, 1947, and a telegram from Gordon Persons, president of the Alabama Public Service Commission, dated June 9, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONOPOLY—ARTICLE BY A. F. WHITNEY, PRESIDENT, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Monopoly—Concentration of Monopoly Power in America Now at Its Peak," by A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, published in the Railroad Trainmen of July 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PEOPLE WIN—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The People Win," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CALL TO ACTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Call to Action," delivered by him at the Roosevelt Hotel, in Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to consider measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, commencing with Order of Business 749.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I add to that that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar we recur to the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, there are five bills on the calendar, all of them very important from the standpoint of the national defense, and perhaps to Army procurement and the procurement for the armed forces generally. Would it be possible to include in the unanimous-consent agreement an agreement that at the end of the call of the calendar these bills could be taken up for consideration tonight?

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. I assume that by unanimous consent any Senator can ask to return to a bill appearing earlier on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

The bill (H. R. 3862) to authorize the Federal Works Administration to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land, was announced as first in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I find myself in a very difficult position with regard to this bill. I should like to accommodate the Senator from Pennsylvania, who was very kind to come to me earlier this evening and discuss the matter with me, knowing my position in regard to the principle the bill involves in connection with the Armed Services Committee.

After my conversation with the Senator from Pennsylvania I conferred with some of my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, and I wish to inform the Senator from Pennsylvania that those with whom I talked feel the way about the bill I feel. We do not see how we can let the bill pass tonight when we have in the Armed Services Committee raised objection to similar bills, and today, through the chairman of the committee, we have presented a resolution which is now pending on the calendar which seeks to work out a policy in regard to this matter.

I merely wanted this statement of explanation in the RECORD so that the Senator from Pennsylvania would understand our position. I must object to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INCOME TAX LIABILITY OF CERTAIN SERVICEMEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 479) relating to the income-tax liability of members of the armed forces dying in the service, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 2, after line 19, to strike out "prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than sec. 3801)" and to insert "prevented (except by the provisions of sec. 3801) by the operation of any law or rule of law."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CREDITS FOR WAR LOSSES

The bill (H. R. 4257) to provide an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3613) to amend secs. 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. At the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over.

REPRESENTATION OF VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS BY CERTAIN MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3546) to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. At the present time, Mr. President, under the law a retired member of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps is not eligible to represent a veterans' organization in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration. The purpose of the bill is to allow veterans to represent such organizations in the presenting of claims to the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

RIO GRANDE BRIDGE, TEXAS

The bill (H. R. 2776) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES H. UNDERWOOD

The bill (H. R. 2534) for the relief of James H. Underwood, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK F. MILES

The bill (H. R. 642) for the relief of Frank F. Miles was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRY V. BALL

The bill (H. R. 2432) for the relief of Harry V. Ball was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIE P. GOODWIN ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 1648) for the relief of Willie P. Goodwin, J. M. Thorud, and W. H. Stokley, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. THEODORE A. GEISSMAN

The bill (H. R. 1791) for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SERVICE CREDIT TO POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1082) to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service, for purposes of determining eligibility and promotion, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service, with an amendment, on page 3, after line 10, to insert two new sections at the end of the bill, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That any employee of the postal service who is in a position for which salary grades are provided in the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, and who transfers or is transferred from such position to any other position in the postal service for which salary grades are provided by such act, shall, for purposes of establishing eligibility for promotion in the position to which he transfers or is transferred, (1) in the case of an employee in a position for which automatic promotions are provided, be credited with all satisfactory service since his last automatic promotion and (2) in the case of an employee in a position for which automatic promotions are not provided, be credited with all satisfactory service, not exceeding 1 year of such service, performed in such position.

SEC. 2. Any such employee shall be eligible for promotion within the salary grades of his new position after completing an amount of service in such position, which when added to the prior service for which credit is provided by the first section of this act, gives such employee sufficient service for promotion in his now position.

SEC. 3. As used in this act, the term "employee" includes postmasters, officers, supervisors, special-delivery messengers in offices of the first class, and all other employees paid from field appropriations of the postal service for whom salary grades are provided in the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945.

SEC 4. This act shall be applicable in determining eligibility for promotion of any employee who has been transferred from one position of the postal service to another prior to the date of enactment of this act and who has not received a promotion in his new position since such transfer, except that no employee shall be promoted because of such application prior to the first day of the first quarter which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 5. Any employee in the postal service whose services are utilized in a dual capacity shall be paid for service rendered in that capacity at the grade and rate of compensation authorized for the position to which he is temporarily assigned, and credit shall be allowed for all previous continuous service as a regular or substitute postal employee.

SEC. 6. The provisions of sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this act shall not apply to employees who transfer or are transferred to the position of post-office inspector or to the position of railway postal clerk.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1720) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator please explain this bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, this bill is to increase the present authorization for the Federal Housing Commissioner, to insure mortgages under title VI of the National Housing Act by $200,000,000. It also provides $750,000,000, the maximum amount of mortgages insured on permanent houses under the Lanham Act.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think it was the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts who asked the question, and I might say that the Banking and Currency Committee, in the extension of the RFC, yielded to the House on the provisions that eliminated the rediscounting of mortgages through the RFC, and since that time these mortgages have gone to the FHA. If I remember, at the time, it was $1,000,000,000 needed in the appropriations. That was eliminated. This only authorizes, as the distinguished Senator from Delaware said, the increase in the FHA mortgage loans to veterans and to other housing authorities, to enable them to go ahead with the work that previously had stopped. I understand that the House Banking and Currency Committee feels as does the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, of which the Senator from Delaware is a representative here, and introduced the bill. It is almost unanimous.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I should really like to know who is to be benefited by this.

Mr. TAFT. I may say the FHA will run out of money. The FHA is the organization which insures the mortgages on new homes. It is probably the most necessary, valuable, and popular organization among the housing organizations.

The $750,000,000, as I understand, includes mortgages on houses which are now owned by the Government, and which are to be sold, as they should be sold, and this bill is to permit special insurance to veterans who buy those houses from the Government for themselves.

Mr. KILGORE. The previous explanation was very incomplete. I am very glad to get the explanation of the Senator from Ohio, and I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out "$2,800,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,000,000,000" and (2) striking out "$3,800,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,200,000,000."

SEC. 2 Title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 610. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this title, the Administrator is authorized, upon application by the mortgagee, to insure or to make commitments to insure under section 603 or section 608 of this title any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any housing acquired or constructed under Public Law 849, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended; Public Law 781, Seventy-sixth Congress as amended; or Public Laws 9, 73, or 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended (including any property acquired, held, or constructed in connection with such housing or

to serve the inhabitants thereof), without regard to—

"(1) any limit as to the time when any mortgage may be insured under this title;

"(2) any limit as to the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under this title, but the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured pursuant to this section shall not exceed $750,000,000;

"(3) any requirement that the obligation be approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction or that the construction be new construction;

"(4) any of the provisions of section 603 (b) (2) or paragraph (B) and (C) of the first sentence of section 608 (b) (3):

Provided, That such mortgage shall (1) otherwise be eligible for insurance under section 603 or section 608, as the case may be, (2) have a maturity not exceeding twenty-five years from the date of insurance, and (3) involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Administrator shall approve) in an amount not exceeding 90 per centum of the appraised value of the mortgage property as determined by the Administrator."

ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AT MEETING OF EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) authorizing attendance of Members of Congress at a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is the same as the House concurrent resolution which has just come over. The clerk will report the House concurrent resolution.

The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) authorizing attendance of Members of Congress at a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association was read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the House concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was agreed to, as follows:

That the Senate and the House of Representatives hereby accept the invitations tendered by the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly of the Bahamas Government to have four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives attend a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association to be held in the Bahamas beginning December 28, 1947. The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives are authorized to appoint the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives, respectively, to attend such meeting, and are further authorized to designate the chairmen of the delegations from each of the Houses. The expenses incurred by the members of the delegations appointed for the purpose of attending such meeting, which shall not exceed $2,000 for each of the delegations, shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members, upon submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation of which they are members.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 152) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "authorized", to insert "during the session, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 102 (g) (2) (D) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, this is to authorize an appropriation of $30,000 for the purpose of bringing down to date the proposed report on Federal and State expenditures. The governors' conference spent a great deal of its time on that subject at the recent meeting. It is a subject that has engaged their interest for quite a while. A subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was appointed to attend the conference. We were unable to do so, on account of the vote on the tax bill the day we were to be there. The governors' conference has appointed, or will soon appoint, a committee of the governors to meet with representatives of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, at the meeting of the conference of State governors this fall, The money is for the purpose of bringing down to date a careful study made 4 or 5 years ago for this body, so that we may get an up-to-date opinion when we meet at that time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I want to make just one or two comments. I notice a number of resolutions here authorizing expenditures of money. Day before yesterday the calendar had on it $280,000 worth of resolutions, asking for more money to investigate something or other. It seems to me that we have pretty nearly gone to seed on these investigations. Everybody wants to investigate something, between now and January 3.

Mr. BRICKER. This is not an investigation. This is simply a research, and for the purpose of a report on the investigation or research work that is done by attorneys and by accountants, so we may have it available at the meeting this fall, and have the matter brought down to date for the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Is this a new project?

Mr. BRICKER. No; it is not a new project. It is a continuation of a project that has been going on for many years, and bringing down to date the very extensive report which was made for the use of the Congress, I think, some 3 or 4 or 5 years ago.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN This is to carry out a duty which devolves upon the committee by reason of the Legislative Reorganization Act of last year. It states that the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments shall have the duty of studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities. There are many fields in which the Federal Government and the States are now overlapping. Most people think of the field of taxation as a principal example.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not going to object to the consideration of the resolution, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. It is to carry out a duty required by law.

Mr. LUCAS. The Legislative Reorganization Act is being interpreted in a good many ways, bringing an unusual number of investigations and research work, it seems to me. I merely wanted to make my position known with respect to the different resolutions that are on the Calendar, and some of the ones that are up for passage at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 153), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1947 (creating a special committee to study the problems of American small business enterprises), is hereby continued until the 31st day of October 1948. Such committee is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $50,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire how much increase is involved in this proposal?

Mr. WHERRY. Fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much has the committee had up until now?

Mr. WHERRY. They have had approximately $7,000 a month since the beginning of the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know, but in the past?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator means in past years?

Mr. BARKLEY. The entire history of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not been here during all the period, but the Senator from Montana, who is chairman, has been. I think it would run as high as $200,000 a year, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that one of the committees whose life was supposed to have been terminated by a resolution a while ago in this session?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the date of the termination?

Mr. WHERRY. The termination was October 31.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska whether this is the Small Business Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. It is.

Mr. MAYBANK. When the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Nebraska, and I were on the Committee on Audit and Control of the Contingent Expenses of the Senate we appropriated many thousands and thousands and tens of thousands of dollars to that committee to get it on the job.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Under the Legislative Reorganization Act, it was extended 1 year?

Mr. WHERRY. It was extended only until October 31.

Mr. MAYBANK. And this extends it until January?

Mr. WHERRY. It extends it for a period of a year from now. If the Senator will yield now, if there is no objection, I should like to have it passed. I am satisfied this passed the Committee on Rules and Administration, with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] present. The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has joined in sponsoring it. I am quite satisfied that if the Senate will agree to the resolution and continue the committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, or some other committee will take over the work of the Small Business Committee. I am sure the Senate will be satisfied if it continues the Small Business Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. WHERRY. O, Mr. President, does the Senator from Arkansas object to the resolution extending the committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is going to be objection, let me make a further statement. The Small Business Committee now has three subcommittees working. One committee is engaged in investigating the subject of newsprint. Another subcommittee is investigating the subject of steel. Another subcommittee is engaged in investigating the subject of mines and mining. The subcommittees are doing very efficient work. I can describe to the distinguished chairman case after case in which the subcommittee on steel, under the able leadership of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has accomplished extremely important and useful work.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Let me make a statement in respect to the subcommittee engaged in investigating the subject of steel. I have received many letters from Minnesota during the last few weeks in which the writers have very highly commended the subcommittee on steel because of the amount of sheet metal we have succeeded in having brought into Minnesota by reason of the activity of the subcommittee on steel. I strongly urge the adoption of the resolution providing the extension of the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, we have now arrived at the point at which I said we would arrive when the resolution providing for the Small Business Committee was adopted last January. The resolution continued the Small Business Committee for a year. Another resolution was adopted which continued the War Investigating Committee for a year. I knew when the time came when the life of the committees would expire that it would be urged that they have not had time enough to perform the work they desired to perform; that there would be plenty of business, so the War Investigating Committee and the Small Business Committee should continue in operation.

There was quite a battle in the Senate in the first part of the year over the question whether the Small Business Committee should be continued as a special committee, or whether it should be taken over by a standing committee. The same thing was true with respect to the War Investigating Committee. It is now proposed that the special investigating committee be continued.

The able Senator from Nebraska is now asking that the committee be continued until October 1948. Yet every statement that was made during the debate upon the floor of the Senate last January was to the end that it was only desired to continue the Small Business Committee for 1 year. That was the statement which was made. That was the theory upon which the Small Business Committee was continued. Now the question of further extension is being considered. We had just as well make the committee a regular standing committee, because that is exactly what it is going to be, so far as appropriations are concerned, and so far as continuation of the staff is concerned.

Mr. President, I dislike to object to a measure of this kind, particularly in view of the fact that the able Senator from Nebraska, the majority whip, who has many responsibilities on the Republican side of the aisle, has performed excellent work in connection with the committee. I desire to commend him for the way he has handled himself on the other side of the aisle during this session. Nevertheless, we get back to the principle that is involved under the Reorganization Act. If we are going to continue to pay no attention to the Reorganization Act, as we have done in many instances during the present session of Congress, what we ought to do when we reconvene is to do away with the act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes in his own time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think it would be only fair for me to say that several important problems have developed in this country.

Mr. LUCAS. It always happens that way.

Mr. MURRAY. I cannot help that. Everyone knows that the newsprint shortage in the United States is one of the most serious shortages confronting us. There is also a serious shortage of steel which is affecting small-business concerns all over the country.

Mr. President, I want to be fair about this matter. The staff of the Small Business Committee is doing an excellent piece of work. The committee has received commendations from business men all over the country for the work it has been doing in connection with the problem of steel shortage and also the problem of newsprint shortage. The committee has worked out a program whereby it is bringing about an apportionment of the newsprint which shall be available, and preventing small newspapers from being closed down. I think the committee is doing an excellent piece of work. I want to be just about the matter.

I have not always gotten along so well with my able friend from Nebraska, but I want to acknowledge that the committee has been doing a good job. It would not be fair for me not to say so.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been a member of the Small Business Committee for a year and a half. I was one who was not overly enthusiastic about the committee about a year ago or less, but I now find that the reason I was not overly enthusiastic was that I did not understand the fine work the committee had done and was doing under the leadership of the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and later under the able leadership of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

I am inclined to believe that some day we will want to make a standing committee out of the Small Business Committee. I feel quite confident about that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it is difficult for Senators on this side of the Chamber to hear what the Senator from Indiana is saying.

Mr. CAPEHART. I said I feel quite confident that the time will come when we will want to make a standing committee of the Small Business Committee, because the duties and responsibilities of the Small Business Committee cut across all other committees.

The Small Business Committee is the only committee to which the small businessmen of America can come and secure help. The small businessman has been able to come to that committee and receive help not only during this year, but last year and the year before. I think it would be a great mistake to discontinue the Senate Small Business Committee. I base that upon my experience with the committee over the past year. I have no doubt it will do valuable work hereafter. I think it would be a mistake to discontinue the committee. I think the small businessmen of America would be very much disappointed if we did so.

I believe the committee has done an excellent job in respect to newsprint,

and it is doing a fine job in respect to steel. It is doing a splendid job in connection with many other subjects. I hope the Senator who objected to the resolution will withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last January I was one of the two or three Republicans, as I recall, who voted against the extension of the Small Business Committee as a special committee. If I were in exactly the same position again as of that date I would vote exactly the same way, because I felt then, and feel now, that as a matter of policy under the reorganization plan the setting up of special committees violates at least the spirit, and I think the clear intent of that plan. But I said during the argument that was had at the time the matter was under discussion, that if we did continue the committee as a special committee it would have a job to do, and that in all probability there might be a need for some extension of it at the end of the terminal period provided in the then extension resolution.

I want to say as one who, I think, has been working as hard as anyone in the Senate on the whole problem of monopoly and monopolistic control, who has an anti-monopoly bill pending in the Senate, that I have found the Small Business Committee the most effective instrument we have had this year in bringing to light some of the monopolistic practices that are strangling small business in this country.

I think it would be a great mistake to take hasty action here tonight cutting off the Small Business Committee without making any plans for continuation of the type of service which the committee is rendering. Therefore, as one who was against this extension, but as one who has worked with the committee this year, and who knows from that experience, growing out of the great service it has rendered to small business in the West, what it is doing in connection with the newsprint problem and the steel problem, I say that it would be a great mistake for us to cut off the committee without further consideration. Therefore I respectively ask the Senator who objected to the continuation of the committee to withdraw his objection, with the understanding that when we meet in January we shall have an opportunity to resurvey the whole problem and decide whether or not we wish to continue the committee as a special committee or bring it under the jurisdiction of some standing committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I heartily agree with what he has said. I believe that the Small Business Committee should be kept in existence until we meet again in January. The Senator from Nebraska well knows that as a member of the old Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, when the Small Business Committee was first created, I never failed, along with him, to vote the necessary funds. The Senator from Nebraska well knows, as do members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that there is a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency which is supposed to look into the problems of small business. It has not been able to do so because it has not had the funds. The Small Business Committee has had the funds.

While I may object to its continuation after January, I shall not object to its continuation until January.

Many of us are members of several committees. A year ago at this time I voted for the reorganization bill, and voted to continue the Small Business Committee. My friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and I were members of the old Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, which appropriated the money.

Today the Small Business Committee is dealing with the problems of steel and newsprint. In other days it dealt with the question of meat, and many other questions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for half a minute?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not on my 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I have only a few comments to make with respect to the resolution to which I objected.

This great interest in small business seems to recur only when an extension of the life of the committee is involved. Only a few days ago we had before us the question of an appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission. I endeavored to have the amount increased to the budget estimate, but I met with no sympathy whatever from the other side of the aisle. The only purpose of that appropriation was to protect small business by enforcing the Clayton Act; but my efforts met with no response.

This may be a little ancient history, but by way of background let me say that there has been no great interest in small business on the other side of the aisle. In the discussion of exemptions from the excess-profits tax we had a very similar result in trying to obtain some benefits for small business under the tax laws.

Of course, Senators are familiar with the effect of section 102 of the revenue act. It is an invitation to the growth of large business. It has contributed toward bringing about a large number of mergers.

As for the work in connection with steel and newsprint, I happen to be a small businessman, and I have not noticed any great improvement in the situation with respect to either of those commodities. The other day I noticed some comments about the Canadian newsprint industry, which, if it had any effect, had an adverse effect on small business. The experience of newspapers in this country with the Canadian newsprint industry has been very sad. We all know the relationship between the price of newsprint bought directly from Canada and newsprint bought on the black market.

The most recent incident, which to me was absolutely inexcusable, was the treatment received by the bill which I introduced more than a year ago and which was unanimously reported from the old Commerce Committee. It was on the calendar last year. It was completely reviewed, rewritten, and modified to meet the objections of everyone except one man representing the National Association of Manufacturers. It met every other objection. The bill was reported to the Senate by the committee with only one or two dissenting votes. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is the only member of the committee that I know of who voted against it. The other day we brought that bill up. It has absolutely no purpose except to benefit small business. It has been recommended by the Department of Commerce, but it received very short shrift in the Senate.

I cannot see any real basis for feeling that there is any sincere interest on the other side of the aisle in small business. I do not propose to vote to extend this committee until there is some better evidence on the other side of the aisle that Republican Senators are really interested in small business. If the resolution proposed to extend the committee only until next January, I think that would be another matter; but it is proposed to extend it for a year or more. I am unable to see that there is any real desire to help small business. Therefore I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to offer an amendment to the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will withhold my objection if it may be passed over until tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator permit me to offer an amendment, in view of what the distinguished Senator said relative to the committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly. I withhold my objection.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution cannot be amended unless it is taken up.

Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate resolution 153?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment. At the proper place in the resolution I propose to amend it by making the date April 1, 1948. The reason I do so is that January and February are busy months. However, I guarantee that there will be all the opportunity that any Senator desires to reinvestigate the committee, and if the Senate does not want the committee on April 1, it will be all right with me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I object to further consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the resolution will be passed over.

TERMINATION OF CERTAIN TAX PROVISIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLIKIN submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II, 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 amendment numbered 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, and agree to the same.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT TAFT,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the report?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the House accepted all the Senate amendments except one, which would have permitted depletion allowances for minerals and mineral salts in connection with potash and thenardite.

Mr. LODGE. What is the effect of the bill now?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The net effect is that approximately 18 amendments of the Senate have been accepted, with the one exception which I have mentioned. The Senator will recall that the bill involved the question of certain exemptions for officer personnel and enlisted men. We allowed a uniform 1-year extension, until the end of next year, to both officers and enlisted men. That is the net effect.

Mr. LODGE. Does the bill lift any existing taxes?

Mr. MILLIKIN. This bill was intended to take a large group of statutes which expired by virtue of the President's proclamation ending hostilities and give them definite expiration dates.

Mr. LODGE. Does it have the effect of removing certain taxes?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It removes the taxes, for example, to the extent of a $1,500 exemption for officers in the military service until the end of the next year. It also completely exempts the pay of military personnel of rank less than that of officer.

Mr. LODGE. But it does not lift excise taxes?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; it has nothing to do with excise taxes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLIKIN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(but only until July 1, 1948, in the case of paper in rolls of less than 15 inches in width)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT TAFT,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The effect of the conference report, Mr. President, is to put on the free list paper which is in rolls of 15 inches or more, on an indefinite basis, and to put on the free list for 1 year, or until July 1, 1948, paper less than 15 inches and not less than 9 inches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any objection to Calendar No. 766, Senate Resolution 120?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that resolution?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this resolution appropriates $25,000 for expenses in connection with hearings held by the Committee on the Judiciary. Forty-five thousand dollars was requested for the extreme activities which the committee had to undertake. The Committee on Rules and Administration cut that to $25,000. I might say that $20,000 of that is for the running of the committee. The Committee on the Judiciary has performed about 30 percent of the activities of the Senate, and has expended up to $10,000, which was appropriated for the two sessions, and we have felt that for the coming session we would have to have approximately $20,000 to cover the entire field of activities that have been designated to us under the Reorganization Act. Only $5,000 is set aside for investigation.

Let me say to the Senate that in order to get things accomplished I have had to loan as many as two or three of my own individual force, out of my office, in connection with the tremendous volume of work which had to be done. We have had approximately 70 nominations, over 700 bills, and it has been approximately an 80-hour-a-week proposition for us. In the sum requested there is $5,000 which involves our obligations to investigate penitentiaries and the other activities delegated to us under the Reorganization Act. We shall have to employ at least two more stenographers, unless it is expected that I provide stenographers.

Mr. LUCAS. Why does it require $25,000 for investigations?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator did not understand me. There is only $5,000 involved in the investigation. Under the Reorganization Act it is not so much a question of investigation as it is of checking up on the responsibilities delegated to the committee. It is a responsibility of the committee to check into patent bills. That we have not been able to do. We shall have to hold hearings on the matter. It is well known how expensive hearings are when reporters are employed for the stenographic work. We are supposed to investigate the penitentiaries. Only $5,000 is set aside for that purpose out of the $25,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of Senate Resolution 120?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 120) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee of the Judiciary.

PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The resolution (S. Res. 148) authorizing the Committee on Public Lands to hold hearings at such times and places as it may deem advisable, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that resolution?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. BUTLER. It provides for the Committee on Public Lands holding hearings at such times and places as the committee may deem advisable. Statehood bills have been introduced with respect to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. It is the intention of the committee to send not the entire committee, but a delegation, to those places, in order to get the work of the committee out of the way

before Congress again convenes. I can assure the Senator from Illinois that the Committee on Public Lands is not going out on a "snooping trip" to investigate either Republicans or Democrats. We are trying to do the work of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. LUCAS. The only point I raise is that it seems rather strange that all of a sudden the committee has to go to Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii because there are some public lands in those places. I do not know whether that has been the custom in the past, but apparently every one has an investigation fever, and wants to travel all over the country and the world to see something or do something. It may be a worthy enterprise. I am not sure. I am only making inquiry for my own information.

Mr. BUTLER. I can assure the Senator from Illinois that it is an entirely worthy enterprise. Of the 13 members of the committee I think only one wants to go to Alaska.

Mr. LUCAS. I can understand that everyone wants to go to Alaska who has not been there.

Mr. BUTLER. There are only four Members making the trip this summer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MAYBANK. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate Resolution 148 will be passed over.

STUDY AND INQUIRY INTO TRENDS, NEEDS AND PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 147) authorizing a study of agricultural legislation and of trends, needs, and problems of agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the resolution. I was not present when the resolution was reported out of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this does not involve an investigation; it involves a study. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, fully appreciates the importance of this study. As the Steagall amendment expires within the year 1948 and the Commodity Credit Corporation also expires within that year, it will have to be reincorporated. Because of that, I feel—and I am sure the other members of the committee share that feeling—that there is need to give more thought and study to the entire agricultural program in order that we shall have the type of program that would be intelligent and acceptable to the public in general. That is the purpose of the study.

Mr. LUCAS. How much is involved?

Mr. THYE. Fifteen thousand dollars.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask that the resolution be temporarily passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a few moments ago when Senate resolution 767 was being discussed, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] objected. I have had a conversation with him, and I think it is the intention of the Senator from South Carolina to withdraw his objection at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I withdraw my objection, because I have had a satisfactory explanation from the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope that it will be passed over for the moment.

Mr. BUTLER. I can assure the Senator from Illinois that the Committee on Public Lands is doing nothing but the work of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that. That is the stock argument always given for investigations. I can understand perfectly well how the minority, when questions of this kind were up for discussion, made inquiries similar to those which the Senator from Illinois is making. That is perfectly proper. I would like to know a little more about where the members of the committee are going, why they are going, what they are going to see, and what they are going to bring back with them.

Mr. BUTLER. Ten bills have been introduced, and there are hearings in connection with the Indian tribes, on the recommendation of the Department of the Interior. We have a hearing scheduled for Klamath Falls on August 18. It would be a little embarrassing if the members of the committee had to pay their own expenses on these trips.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure it would be embarrassing if I had to pay my expenses on one of those trips, because I could not do it. I do not know why it is necessary.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to remind the Senator from Illinois that in the previous Congress I have heard him ask, when he was standing where he now stands, for as much as $100,000 at one time, and there was never a peep from the then minority side.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I heard plenty of objections from what was the minority side, when I was chairman of the former Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. It was rather difficult for the Senator from Illinois to have action taken on any measures of this sort when he was chairman of that committee, without having objections made by Senators on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let us see if we can proceed in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the resolution will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

INVESTIGATION OF THE HOUSING FIELD

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) establishing a joint committee to investigate the entire housing field was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of that measure.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this is a concurrent resolution sponsored by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the junior Senator from Wisconsin. It has received unanimous approval not only by the Banking and Currency Committee, but also by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A companion measure was passed by the House of Representatives yesterday.

The purpose of the investigation is obvious from the title of the concurrent resolution. It is to conduct an investigation of the housing situation from A to Z, and to recommend at the next session of the Congress legislation to correct the situation, if possible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that we have consulted with the House leaders on the two subjects of the cost of housing, in particular, and high prices, in particular, the subjects of Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, Calendars Nos. 769 and 770. I understand that the leaders are prepared to urge the adoption of the concurrent resolutions. They provide for the establishment of joint committees.

These measures certainly cover the two subjects that are of the most interest and, I would say, are the most difficult subjects today before the people.

I think the purpose of Senators on both sides of the aisle who have discussed these matters is well understood. They feel that as to these two particular subjects, we should have a definite report before the Senate when we return.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me inquire about Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, Calendar No. 770, the next concurrent resolution on the calendar, which of course is not before the Senate at this time. I understood that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report was considering that very matter, if I correctly recall what the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio said one day.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the resolution has been amended, as the Senator will see, at my request, to show that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report is authorized and directed to make these investigations through two or more subcommittees on which there may be other members from outside the committee. The committee is rather limited in number. If we are going to have hearings in several places, I think we can do so, perhaps, with the amount of money the committee has available, although this matter involves somewhat more extensive hearings than were contemplated. So we have requested an additional $25,000. I do not think the additional $25,000 is absolutely necessary. If it is made available, it will not be used unless it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. LUCAS. I say to the Senator that I think Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, Calendar No. 770, is one of the most important resolutions that has been submitted to the Congress, and I would not object to the expenditure of any amount of money for it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we have already conducted investigations on prices in Washington, during the past 6 weeks, and we have had people of general standing come in and testify. We have felt that we could do much better with some hearings in September and October in determining the nature of local prices.

Mr. President, what is proposed is not in the nature of a junket. No one would want to travel in connection with these hearings, unless he felt compelled to do so; and any travel that is done in connection with them will be done only because it is a duty.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that. The work of investigation is hard. This investigation is an important one, as I see it. I shall not object to either of these measures. I simply wished to make some inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were, on page 1, in line 5, after the word "Senate", to strike out the comma and the words "of which at least three shall be," and insert "who are"; in line 7, after the word "currency", to strike out "and at least two shall be members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare"; on page 2, in line 1, after the words "Representatives", to strike out the comma and the words "of which at least three shall be," and insert "who are"; in line 3, after the word "Currency", to strike out "and at least two shall be members of the House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor,"; on page 3, in line 24, after the word "power", to strike out the comma and the words "without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended,"; on page 4, line 3, after the word "experts", to insert "consultants,"; in line 4, after the word "duties" and the comma, to strike out "including consultants who shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $35 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the committee, together with their necessary travel and subsistence expenses", and insert, "but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923 as amended, for comparable duties."; on page 5, after line 7, to strike out "Sec. 6. The members of the committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session."; in line 14, after "Sec.", to strike out "7", and insert "6"; and in line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000", and insert "$50,000", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing (hereafter referred to as the Committee), and to be composed of seven Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and seven Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House of Representatives Committee on Banking and Currency to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of the entire field of housing, including but not limited to—

(1) the extent of the need for housing in the United States as a whole and in all areas thereof;

(2) the extent, if any, to which shortages in building materials are contributing to the shortage of housing;

(3) the reasons for the existing high costs of building materials and housing and the action which may be taken to reduce such costs;

(4) all factors of whatever kind or nature which contribute to the existing high costs of housing and which prevent the speedy construction of adequate housing to satisfy the needs of the Nation; and the action which may be taken to eliminate such factors;

(5) the extent to which archaic building codes contribute to the existing shortage and excessive cost of housing;

(6) the administration and operation of existing Federal laws relating to slum clearance, insurance of mortgages on housing, home loans, guaranties of veterans' housing loans, construction permits, veterans' preference in the renting and purchase of housing, rent control, and all other matters relating to housing;

(7) the availability of private capital and of Government loans to finance the construction of housing;

(8) the organization and operations of Government agencies concerned with housing; and

(9) such other problems and subjects in the field of housing as the committee deems appropriate.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 15, 1948, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable, and shall make its final report not later than January 2, 1949.

SEC. 4. The committee shall have the power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, consultants, and employees at its deems necessary for the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee is further authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government and may request the governments of the several States, representatives of business, industry, finance, and labor, and such other persons, agencies, organizations, and instrumentalities as it deems appropriate to attend its hearings and to give and present information, advice, and recommendations.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned period of the Eightieth Congress; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take such testimony; to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair now hands down a companion measure, House Concurrent Resolution 104, to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing.

The question is, to strike out all after the enacting clause in the House concurrent resolution, and to insert in lieu thereof the text of the Senate concurrent resolution as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether all these investigating committees' resolutions, especially these two, provide for minority representation on the joint committees in an appropriate proportion.

Mr. TAFT. I know that Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, Calendar No. 770, does. The representation is 2 to 1 in each case, with three Members of the House of Representatives and three Members of the Senate on each committee, and in each case there will be two Republicans and one Democrat.

I do not know about Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, Calendar No. 769.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that all these resolutions which came from the Committee on Rules and Administration were the subject of a rather unusual experience in the Senate, in that they were unanimously reported with the complete approval of the minority side.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to know that, and yet I should like to know whether they provide for minority representation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, that is not provided in these measures. We assume that is implicit, and the usual procedure to be followed. It provides for a 14-member committee, with 7 Members from the House of Representatives and 7 from the Senate. Frankly, we did not think it was necessary to provide that there be 4 of one party and 3 of the other.

Mr. BARKLEY. Usually such resolutions provide for both parties to be represented.

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may interrupt, let me say that I shall be very glad to accept an amendment so providing, if the Senator will offer it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I can give the Senator from Kentucky the assurance that the representation will be 4 and 3 in both the House and the Senate, if the Senator will accept that assurance.

Mr. BARKLEY. With that assurance, I shall not press for the adoption of an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair can give a better assurance, because that is what the Chair will do in making the appointments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank all the assurers for all their assurances.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is it the purpose to investigate the shortage of housing and how we can provide or can begin to provide housing for the people of the country?

Mr. TAFT. It covers the entire housing field. The emphasis is on the cost of housing, because the cost of housing is the center of the difficulty.

The particular things which were intended to be investigated were the reasons for the high cost of housing—the high cost of building, the possible combinations between materialmen on costs, possible restrictive labor practices, building codes in different cities—things which apparently have put housing beyond the ability of the ordinary man to purchase housing or even to live in new housing.

That is the main thing, because we have had investigations on the general subject of public housing, a subject which is before the Congress, and which will be definitely before the next Congress, a question of principle, rather than an investigation.

Mr. PEPPER. Why has the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill, a bill which has been spoken of favorably as offering some hope for more adequate housing for the country, not been put on the "must" list for legislation in this session?

Mr. TAFT. Because the time taken and the difficulty of eliminating the controversies has been so insuperable that it means it will lead to the consumption of unlimited time, and we never had the time, nor could we get assurance from the House that they would be willing to consider it at this session. It may be taken up at the next session.

Mr. PEPPER. Reserving the right to object, I wish to make the observation that I cannot escape the feeling that the Congress is going to be condemned by the people of the country for the little progress, as a matter of fact, almost for the retrogression we have permitted in respect to the furnishing of adequate housing. It is a source of very deep regret to me that we have not done something effective in this Congress which might offer some future hope, if not present encouragement, to the people of the country who have no adequate places in which to live.

If this investigation offers any hope, I am delighted, but I must say that when we have done in the Congress the very things which have run up the price of housing, including taking off the power of the Government to allocate materials for homes, including homes for veterans, instead of commercial construction, when we have taken off controls, practically, over rents, and when we have so long delayed the giving of any subsidy, it looks to me as if everything Congress has done has been in the direction of higher cost for housing, and it is late in the session to begin to repent and to investigate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question. Did I understand the Senator from Illinois to say in answer to the question of the Senator from Kentucky that these resolutions had been passed unanimously in the Rules Committee by Senators from both sides of the aisle? I understood him further to say that division was some 2 to 1, Republican representation against Democratic representation, in all of which I am most interested. I understand this particular resolution was introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin and that the law calls for representation which is equitable and just; that is, a representation of 4 to 3. Am I correct in that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not sure I understood the question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The committee composition, under the resolution, calls for four Republicans and three Democrats. Am I correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the concurrent resolution to be read a third time.

The concurrent resolution was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BRICKER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. MAYBANK conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next number on the calendar.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS TO HOLD HEARINGS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to order of business 757, Senate Resolution 148, authorizing the Committee on Public Lands to hold hearings at such times and places as it may deem advisable.

I wish to state that I consider this resolution very important. The Committee on Public Lands is trying to work out a program for the various Indian reservations throughout the United States. I think it is important that that be done. We have gone along trying to administer Indian affairs without a definite program for all the various Indian reservations. We are trying to work out a definite reclamation program in the West, and I hope the Senator from Illinois will withdraw his objection and that the resolution may be agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent that the Senate recur to Calendar 767, Senate Resolution 148. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 148) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, for the purpose of making a study and investigation of any matter referred to such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Eightieth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

INVESTIGATION OF HIGH PRICES

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) to establish a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, this resolution reaches the ultimate in ridiculousness. We all know why prices are high. We have high prices because the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] tried to outdo each other in seeing who could scuttle most of the OPA the quickest. So what is the use of investigating unless we investigate the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Nebraska, and why they did it? Of course we are going to have high prices when such things happen.

Mr. President, this business of investigating is getting to be a racket. In fact, it has gone to such lengths that a song has been written about it, whose title is, "Who's Going To Investigate the Man That Investigates the Man That Investigates Me?"

We have committees to investigate everything under the sun. Practically every Senator on the other side of the aisle has a private committee. I have been in the Senate several years and I have never had a committee.

Mr. President, we have a Small Business Committee—they are all small business; we have war investigating committees. What do they investigate? They investigate Howard Hughes' bathing beauties. They can find nothing better than that to investigate, because

that gets in the newspapers through pictures of bathing beauties. We have committees for this and that. Some of them make a Roman holiday out of assassinating the characters of innocent and guilty alike. For instance, some investigating committees said that a gentleman by the name of Bernstein had been in the Army and said he was kicked out. He had to get a general to write him a recommendation and say that he was not kicked out, but he will never be able to prove satisfactorily that he was not kicked out. He was an honorable serviceman.

Dr. Oppenheimer, one of the finest of atomic scientists, who helped perfect the atomic bomb, found his brother accused of being a Communist. This "red" does not rub off very easily these days, so Oppenheimer is contaminated, although his brother denied it. The more one denies the more he is suspected. I found that out, so I do not deny things any more.

There is Dr. Condon, of the Bureau of Standards. I understand the committee said they were going to subpena him to come and testify before them, but they had never even asked him to come and testify. However, they were going to subpena him and make it look as if he would not testify, without his ever having been asked.

Lo and behold, a few days ago we confirmed Secretary Royall the next head man in the War Department. And what do we find out? We find that his brother-in-law, the man who married his half-sister, is Johann Steele, suspected of being a Communist. So Secretary Royall is in some difficulty. He said he did not pay much attention to his brother-in-law, and they wanted to know why he did not, what kind of a man he was that he did not hold his brother-in-law to his bosom and love him.

So, Mr. President, you are damned if you do and damned if you do not. [Laughter.]

I understand that in the State Department, in their loyalty investigation, they asked these two questions, among others:

"Were you in favor of the Taft-Hartley bill?"

"Were you in favor of tax reduction?"

Mr. President, that is a good one. I should like to know what that has to do with anyone's loyalty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I find there is an omission in this concurrent resolution 770, on page 6, line 2, before the period, where there should be inserted the language "take the action prescribed in section 2 hereof."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator withdraw his objection while I make a brief statement with reference to this bill?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly. I shall be happy to show that courtesy to the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, this bill, which was originally introduced by me in the form of a resolution, called for a special committee, but in order to avoid the difficulty of running into the problem of creating a new committee and of duplicating another committee, we finally amended the resolution and made this committee a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

I might say, Mr. President, that I hold in my hand a series of petitions which were presented to me by representatives of the following organizations: The American Veterans' Committee, the CIO, the CIO auxiliaries, the National Council of Jewish Women, the League of Women Shoppers, the Committee for Social Action of the Congregational Churches, the National Women's Trade Union League, and the National Association for Colored People, as well as the Americans for Democratic Action. Mr. President, there is no subject in the minds of the people of the United States that is more important than this, and there is no way that the Congress can better get the facts than to have a bipartisan impartial investigation of consumer prices. I ask the Senator from Idaho if he will not withhold his objection, so that this committee can be formed and be put to work.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, Mr. President. I refuse to withhold my objection. I cannot see any justification for this committee whatever. High prices are here. There is nothing that can be done about it. They cannot be rolled back. They came because the OPA was scuttled. The Republicans are responsible. I object. [Laughter.]

Mr. BALDWIN. I will leave the subject with one question: Does the Senator from Idaho want to accept the responsibility for standing in the way of action by this Congress to find out the basis and reason and cause of high prices?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; no. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are responsible for that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point certain remarks I had intended to make at great length, but which I did not make, because I did not want to take the time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RAYMOND E. BALDWIN RE SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 19

Though I do not believe it necessary to provide any statistical demonstration either of the fact that prices of consumer goods in this country are dangerously high or of the fact that our people are deeply concerned about that grave problem, I would like to call the Senate's attention to the following facts. According to Bureau of Labor statistics, food prices—as of April this year—are 93 percent higher than in January 1941, and one-third higher than a year ago. Clothing prices are 82 percent higher than in 1941 and 20 percent higher than a year ago. Public opinion polls have demonstrated consistently over the past year that our people are more concerned about high prices than about any other single domestic issue.

Unfortunately, these high prices are not limited to luxuries or unessential goods. The necessities of living—bread, meat, clothing, housing—cost more than our people can well afford to pay.

This is no time for political recriminations, nor is it any time to try to place blame. The hour is late and the disturbing facts remain. It is up to us, as a Congress representing the people of this country, to demonstrate our recognition of this condition.

There are those who have said that high wages are the sole cause of the present high prices, though statistics would not seem to bear that out. There are those who have said that the shipment of goods to Europe and Government buying is the sole cause of high prices. Statistics would not seem to bear that out, but, if that is true, let us at least demonstrate to our people the choice they have. There are those who claim natural shortages are causing high prices. There are those who claim that artificial shortages are causing high prices. There are those who claim that exorbitant profits are causing high prices. Whatever the causes, let us find out and inform our people fully.

Beyond all of these reasons, or alleged reasons, for high prices, I believe this country is now suffering from a high-price psychology. Those who sell goods have come to believe, with some justification, that buyers will pay—and can pay—almost any price. We have almost come to accept exorbitantly high prices as a vicious but unchangeable evil. This high-price psychology has a spiraling effect. For the sake of preserving a sound national economy, for the sake of our people who are bearing the heavy burden, we must discourage that kind of thinking.

The proposed resolution directs the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to make a study of high prices at the consumer level. This investigation would serve at least three useful purposes. First, it would demonstrate to our people that we, as a Congress, are not unaware of their serious concern and that we propose to do whatever we can to relieve them of the burden of high prices. Second, such an investigation could be expected to uncover reasons that should lead to action on the part of our people or our Government—if necessary—to bring about a downward trend in prices. Third, such an investigation would serve the policing purpose of bringing down prices, in cases where exorbitant profits might exist, by turning on a spotlight of public information.

This resolution calls for the establishment of two or more subcommittees of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. The subcommittees would be made up of Members of the House and the Senate and of both parties. It is my hope that three or four such subcommittees would operate more or less autonomously in various sections of the country for the purpose of hearing the story of high prices from the people themselves. These subcommittees, I believe, should act as a forum before which our worried people could appear. It should be their purpose to trace down the cost of necessities from their production to the consumer in order to determine fairly and openly what is causing these exorbitant prices. We are, as a body, sufficiently equipped in the field of theoretical economic studies—which have so far produced no solution or relief—and no information on prices intelligible to the housewife trying to meet a household food budget. I envisage this investigation not as a study of statistical tables, but as a study of human relationships, a study in which our peo-

ple can take part in solving a common problem.

In our democracy, we believe in a free enterprise system. We do not want to return to the days of shortages and black markets. It is, therefore, up to us on both sides of the aisle to do all in our power to make this free economy work. I cannot express too strongly, my deep conviction that this Congress must, before its adjournment, make a practical move which will have as its purpose to reduce prices on consumer goods, not from a study of the advanced theory of economics, but from a study of the price of a loaf of bread. It we should adjourn this session of Congress without having demonstrated to our people our concern for their major domestic worry, we would have served them poorly indeed.

This resolution will, in my estimation, help to reduce the price of consumer goods to the point our people can afford to buy them in the quantities they need and in the quantities that makes possible large production and wide employment. I sincerely hope that Senators on both sides of the aisle will join in this common effort to solve a critical domestic worry.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 768, Senate Resolution 147, which was objected to temporarily by the senior Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont asks unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 768, Senate Resolution 147. The Clerk will state the resolution.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 147) authorizing a study of agricultural legislation and of trends, needs, and problems of agriculture.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Illinois advises me that he withdraws his objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, have we reached Order No. 772, House bill 1826?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next order on the calendar is 771, House bill 452, when we get to it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Have we reached Order No. 773, House bill 4110?

Mr. AIKEN. No; not as yet.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask whether that bill and Senate Resolution 147 are the same. Are they going to overlap?

Mr. AIKEN. We have reverted to Calendar No. 768, Senate Resolution 147.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The resolution proposes to authorize "a study of agricultural legislation and of trends, needs, and problems of agriculture." The one I refer to is a little further down on the calendar. It is House bill 4110, to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture." Now, what is the relationship?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would be very glad to explain that when we get to it. It is designed to correct a mistake which was made last year. The calendar number which I asked to revert was 768, Senate Resolution 147. It was objected to temporarily by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who has withdrawn his objection. It is proposed to provide a modest sum for the most important purpose, I think, of any of the resolutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Just one moment, Mr. President. The Senator says "a most modest sum, for a most important objective"?

Mr. AIKEN. Objective, not objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It might take more than a most modest sum.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It may take more than that, if the purpose of the Commission is all-important. But does it conflict directly with House bill 4110?

Mr. AIKEN. No. I shall be glad to explain House bill 4110 when we reach it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not want to wait that long, and to pass this over in the meantime. I want to know now. Where is the conflict? Is there an overlapping? That is what I want to know, now.

Mr. AIKEN. No. There is no connection between the resolution and the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, just a moment. The Senator says there is no relationship?

Mr. AIKEN. There is no connection whatever. When we passed the agriculture research bill last year, it contained a proviso in it that 20 percent of the amount authorized must be spent for marketing research. What we meant to say was 20 percent of the amount appropriated, and the bill, in which the Senator is interested, H. R. 4110, seeks to correct that, so that 20 percent of the amount appropriated will be spent for marketing research instead of 20 percent of the amount authorized, because the amount appropriated is considerably less I believe than the amount authorized, and therefore an inordinate amount would be spent for marketing research, unless the correction in the law is made. The purpose is simply to correct a mistake which Congress made last year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then H. R. 4110 is simply a technical correction of the existing law?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct; that is its purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And what is the purpose of Order No. 768, Senate Resolution 147?

Mr. AIKEN. That is a request for $15,000 for the Senate Agriculture Committee, to use in working out a long-range agricultural program, to take effect when the provisions of the Steagall amendment expires on December 31 next year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am very glad to have that explanation. I merely wanted to determine, if possible, that we are not duplicating effort.

Mr. AIKEN. We are not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I object to this Agricultural Committee. Is that what it is?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is Order No. 768, Senate Resolution 147.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, authorizing a study of the problems of agriculture. What is the use of studying the problems of agriculture, with a Republican Congress? That is what we want to know. What is the matter? What are agriculture's needs? They need REA. Yes, they need REA. What did the Republican Congress do? They cut the appropriations for REA. The farmers need fertilizer, and they are unable to get much of it. They need reclamation programs, so the GI's will be reclaiming farm lands, and those that are on the lands will have more water. Those appropriations have been cut.

One may go down the line with respect to practically everything that agriculture needs—and we all know what it needs—and find that the appropriations have been cut. So why investigate? The answer is plain: What agriculture needs, Mr. President, is a Democratic administration. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator objects, and the resolution is passed over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Did the Senator object?

Mr. TAYLOR. I had not finished speaking. I have 5 minutes, have I not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's 5 minutes, if he hurries, still remains to him, to the extent of 2 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I shall take 5 minutes on the next one.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator objects. The resolution will be passed over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, since there seems to be a good deal of politics injected into the proceedings at a late hour tonight, it seems to me we would gain time by recessing until tomorrow morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is a small Executive Calendar. Perhaps we can dispose of the nominations on the calendar before we recess.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I would object to taking up the Executive Calendar now.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour and the certainty that we could not conclude the bills on the calendar for some substantial time, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes a. m. Saturday, July 26, 1947) the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock meridian the same day.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 25 (legislative day of July 16), 1947:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Edward Sedley Bres (colonel, Corps of Engineers Reserve), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Harry Hawkins Vaughan (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery Reserve), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Andrew Frank McIntyre (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. Benjamin Franklin Riter, Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve, Army of the United States.

Brig Gen. Herbert Norman Schwarzkopf (lieutenant colonel, Infantry, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

HONORARY RESERVE

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Carlton Spencer Dargusch (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Col. John Thomas Taylor, Chemical Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman John C. Shannon (Naval Academy) to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 6th day of June 1947:

Charles R. Mischke

Charles B. Teal

Jerry W. Bates (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu of assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy with the rank of ensign:

Robert C. Doerpinghaus

William E. Nims

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JULY 25, 1947

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art ever drawing us to Thyself with the gentle compulsions of Thy spirit, may this moment of prayer lead us into the fellowship of nobler aspirations and endeavors.

Inspire us with a faith that has larger realizations of divine wisdom and power and wider applications to the problems of these days which are so full of changes, confusions, and conflicts.

May the nations of the earth and the members of the human family be mindful of one another, and in their common remembrance may they bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 72. An act to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 673. An act to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels;

H. R. 1238. An act to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 1341. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.;

H. R. 1633. An act to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia";

H. R. 1714. An act to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2054. An act to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service;

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H.R. 3043. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3541. An act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3619. An act relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.;

H. R. 4084. An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments; and

H. R. 4268. An act making supplemental appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 176. An act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions; to establish the National Institute of Dental Research; and for other purposes;

S. 342. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.;

S. 722. An act to authorize the issuance of Oregon Trail commemoration 50-cent pieces to the Oregon Trail Monument Association, Idaho Unit, Inc.;

S. 1042. An act to provide for the completion of Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by issuance of a special coin;

S. 1064. Relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service;

S. 1116. To provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army and Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States;

S. 1305. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Power Act so as to provide that the States may apply for reservation of portions of power sites released for entry, location, or selection to the States for highway purposes;

S. 1543. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended;

S. 1614. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the patriotic services of Gen. Maurice Rose and to perpetuate the General Rose Memorial Hospital as a historic shrine;

S. 1648. An act to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners;

S. 1721. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of injuries sustained by G. R. Below, late of Seattle, Wash.; and

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 859. An act to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high-seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2173. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a letter which I have sent to my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska on the accomplishment of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

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

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

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

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. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, 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 amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SHORT TITLE

"That this Act may be cited as the 'National Security Act of 1947'.

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Sec. 2. Declaration of policy.

"TITLE I—COORDINATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

"Sec. 101. National Security Council.
"Sec. 102. Central Intelligence Agency.
"Sec. 103. National Security Resources Board.

"TITLE II—THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

"Sec. 201. National Military Establishment.
"Sec. 202. Secretary of Defense.
"Sec. 203. Military Assistants to the Secretary.
"Sec. 204. Civilian personnel.
"Sec. 205. Department of the Army.
"Sec. 206. Department of the Navy.
"Sec. 207. Department of the Air Force.
"Sec. 208. United States Air Force.
"Sec 209. Effective date of transfers.
"Sec. 210. War Council.
"Sec. 211. Joint Chiefs of Staff.
"Sec. 212. Joint staff.
"Sec. 213. Munitions Board.
"Sec. 214. Research and Development Board.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"Sec. 301. Compensation of Secretaries.
"Sec. 302. Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries.
"Sec. 303. Advisory committees and personnel.
"Sec. 304. Status of transferred civilian personnel.
"Sec. 305. Saving provisions.
"Sec. 306. Transfer of funds.
"Sec. 307. Authorization for appropriations.
"Sec. 308. Definitions.
"Sec. 309. Separability.
"Sec. 310. Effective date.
"Sec. 311. Succession to the Presidency.

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. In enacting this legislation, it is the intent of Congress to provide a comprehensive program for the future security of the United States; to provide for the establishment of integrated policies and procedures for the departments, agencies, and functions of the Government relating to the national security; to provide three military departments for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy (including naval aviation and the United States Marine Corps), and the Air Force, with their assigned combat and service components; to provide for their authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control but not to merge them; to provide for the effective strategic direction of the armed forces and for their operation under unified control and for their integration into an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces.

"TITLE I—COORDINATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

"NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

"SEC. 101. (a) There is hereby established a council to be known as the National Security Council (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Council').

"The President of the United States shall preside over meetings of the Council: *Provided*, That in his absence he may designate a member of the Council to preside in his place.

"The function of the Council shall be to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security.

"The Council shall be composed of the President; the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Defense, appointed under section 202; the Secretary of the Army, referred to in section 205; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force, appointed under section 207; the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, appointed under section 103; and such of the following-named officers as the President may designate from time to time: The Secretaries of the executive departments, the Chairman of the Munitions Board appointed under section 213, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board appointed under section 214; but no such additional member shall be designated until the advice and consent of the Senate has been given to his appointment to the office the holding of which authorizes his designation as a member of the Council.

"(b) In addition to performing such other functions as the President may direct, for the purpose of more effectively coordinating the policies and functions of the departments and agencies of the Government relating to the national security, it shall, subject to the direction of the President, be the duty of the Council—

"(1) to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President in connection therewith; and

"(2) to consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith.

"(c) The Council shall have a staff to be headed by a civilian executive secretary who shall be appointed by the President, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year. The executive secretary, subject to the direction of the Council, is hereby authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Council in connection with the performance of its functions.

"(d) The Council shall, from time to time, make such recommendations, and such other reports to the President as it deems appropriate or as the President may require.

"CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

"SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby established under the National Security Council a Central Intelligence Agency with a Director of Central Intelligence, who shall be the head thereof. The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the commissioned officers of the armed services or from among individuals in civilian life. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

"(b) (1) If a commissioned officer of the armed services is appointed as Director then—

"(A) in the performance of his duties as Director, he shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were a civilian in no way connected with the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the armed services or any component thereof; and

"(B) he shall not possess or exercise any supervision, control, powers, or functions (other than such as he possesses, or is authorized or directed to exercise, as Director), with respect to the armed services or any component thereof, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, or any branch, bureau, unit or division thereof, or with respect to any of the personnel (military or civilian) of any of the foregoing.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (1), the appointment to the office of Director of a commissioned officer of the armed services, and his acceptance of and service in such office, shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the armed services, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade. Any such commissioned officer shall, while serving in the office of Director, receive the military pay and allowances (active or retired, as the case may be) payable to a commissioned officer of his grade and length of service and shall be paid, from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Agency, annual compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which $14,000 exceeds the amount of his annual military pay and allowances.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Director of Central Intelligence may, in his discretion, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Agency whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States, but such termination shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government if declared eligible for such

employment by the United States Civil Service Commission.

"(d) For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, it shall be the duty of the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council—

"(1) to advise the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security;

"(2) to make recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security;

"(3) to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government using where appropriate existing agencies and facilities: *Provided*, That the Agency shall have no police, subpena, law-enforcement powers, or internal-security functions: *Provided further*, That the departments and other agencies of the Government shall continue to collect, evaluate, correlate, and disseminate departmental intelligence: *And provided further*, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure;

"(4) to perform, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally;

"(5) to perform such other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

"(e) To the extent recommended by the National Security Council and approved by the President, such intelligence of the departments and agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, relating to the national security shall be open to the inspection of the Director of Central Intelligence, and such intelligence as relates to the national security and is possessed by such departments and other agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, shall be made available to the Director of Central Intelligence for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination: *Provided, however*, That upon the written request of the Director of Central Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall make available to the Director of Central Intelligence such information for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination as may be essential to the national security.

"(f) Effective when the Director first appointed under subsection (a) has taken office—

"(1) the National Intelligence Authority (11 Fed. Reg. 1337, 1339, February 5, 1946) shall cease to exist; and

"(2) the personnel, property, and records of the Central Intelligence Group are transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency, and such Group shall cease to exist. Any unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available or authorized to be made available for such Group shall be available and shall be authorized to be made available in like manner for expenditure by the Agency.

"NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

"SEC. 103. (a) There is hereby established a National Security Resources Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board') to be composed of the Chairman of the Board and such heads or representatives of the various executive departments and independent agencies as may from time to time be designated by the President to be members of the Board. The Chairman of the Board shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

"(b) The Chairman of the Board, subject to the direction of the President, is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Board in carrying out its functions.

"(c) It shall be the function of the Board to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization, including—

"(1) policies concerning industrial and civilian mobilization in order to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the event of war;

"(2) programs for the effective use in time of war of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions;

"(3) policies for unifying, in time of war, the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products;

"(4) the relationship between potential supplies of, and potential requirements for, manpower, resources, and productive facilities in time of war;

"(5) policies for establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical material, and for the conservation of these reserves;

"(6) the strategic relocation of industries, services, government, and economic activities, the continuous operation of which is essential to the Nation's security.

"(d) In performing its functions, the Board shall utilize to the maximum extent the facilities and resources of the departments and agencies of the Government.

"TITLE II—THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

"ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

"SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established the National Military Establishment, and the Secretary of Defense shall be the head thereof.

"(b) The National Military Establishment shall consist of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, together with all other agencies created under title II of this Act.

"SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 202. (a) There shall be a Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That a person who has within ten years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the national security. Under the direction of the President and subject to the provisions of this Act he shall perform the following duties:

"(1) Establish general policies and programs for the National Military Establishment and for all of the departments and agencies therein;

"(2) Exercise general direction, authority, and control over such departments and agencies;

"(3) Take appropriate steps to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, and research;

"(4) Supervise and coordinate the preparation of the budget estimates of the departments and agencies comprising the National Military Establishment; formulate and determine the budget estimates for submittal to the Bureau of the Budget; and supervise the budget programs of such departments and agencies under the applicable appropriation Act: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force from presenting to the President or to the Director of the Budget, after first so informing the Secretary of Defense, any report or recommendation relating to his department which he may deem necessary: *And provided further*, That the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force shall be administered as individual executive departments by their respective Secretaries and all powers and duties relating to such departments not specifically conferred upon the Secretary of Defense by this Act shall be retained by each of their respective Secretaries.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit annual written reports to the President and the Congress covering expenditures, work, and accomplishments of the National Military Establishment, together with such recommendations as he shall deem appropriate.

"(c) The Secretary of Defense shall cause a seal of office to be made for the National Military Establishment, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"MILITARY ASSISTANTS TO THE SECRETARY

"SEC. 203. Officers of the armed services may be detailed to duty as assistants and personal aides to the Secretary of Defense, but he shall not establish a military staff.

"CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to appoint from civilian life not to exceed three special assistants to advise and assist him in the performance of his duties. Each such special assistant shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such other civilian personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the functions of the National Military Establishment other than those of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

"SEC. 205. (a) The Department of War shall hereafter be designated the Department of the Army, and the title of the Secretary of War shall be changed to Secretary of the Army. Changes shall be made in the titles of other officers and activities of the Department of the Army as the Secretary of the Army may determine.

"(b) All laws, orders, regulations, and other actions relating to the Department of War or to any officer or activity whose title is changed under this section shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, be deemed to relate to the Department of the Army within the National Military Establishment or to such officer or activity designated by his or its new title.

"(c) The term 'Department of the Army' as used in this Act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Army at the seat of government and all field headquarters, forces, reserve components, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Army.

"(d) The Secretary of the Army shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of the Army, of such design as the President may approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"(e) In general the United States Army, within the Department of the Army, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation and water transport as may

be organic therein. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations on land. It shall be responsible for the preparation of land forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Army to meet the needs of war.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

"SEC. 206. (a) The term 'Department of the Navy' as used in this Act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Navy at the seat of government; the headquarters, United States Marine Corps; the entire operating forces of the United States Navy, including naval aviation, and of the United States Marine Corps, including the reserve components of such forces; all field activities, headquarters, forces, bases, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Navy; and the United States Coast Guard when operating as a part of the Navy pursuant to law.

"(b) In general the United States Navy, within the Department of the Navy, shall include naval combat and services forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations at sea. It shall be responsible for the preparation of naval forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned, and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Navy to meet the needs of war.

"All naval aviation shall be integrated with the naval service as part thereof within the Department of the Navy. Naval aviation shall consist of combat and service and training forces, and shall include land-based naval aviation, air transport essential for naval operations, all air weapons and air techniques involved in the operations and activities of the United States Navy, and the entire remainder of the aeronautical organization of the United States Navy, together with the personnel necessary therefor.

"The Navy shall be generally responsible for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping.

"The Navy shall develop aircraft, weapons, tactics, technique, organization and equipment of naval combat and service elements; matters of joint concern as to these functions shall be coordinated between the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy.

"(c) The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. The Marine Corps shall be organized, trained, and equipped to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign. It shall be the duty of the Marine Corps to develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force, those phases of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by landing forces. In addition, the Marine Corps shall provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, shall provide security detachments for the protection of naval property at naval stations and bases, and shall perform such other duties as the President may direct: *Provided*, That such additional duties shall not detract from or interfere with the operations for which the Marine Corps is primarily organized. The Marine Corps shall be responsible, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Marine Corps to meet the needs of war.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

"SEC. 207. (a) Within the National Military Establishment there is hereby established an executive department to be known as the Department of the Air Force, and a Secretary of the Air Force, who shall be the head thereof. The Secretary of the Air Force shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes is amended to include the Department of the Air Force and the provisions of so much of title IV of the Revised Statutes as now or hereafter amended as is not inconsistent with this Act shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force.

"(c) The term 'Department of the Air Force' as used in this Act shall be construed to mean the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government and all field headquarters, forces, reserve components, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Air Force.

"(d) There shall be in the Department of the Air Force an Under Secretary of the Air Force and two Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(e) The several officers of the Department of the Air Force shall perform such functions as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe.

"(f) So much of the functions of the Secretary of the Army and of the Department of the Army, including those of any officer of such Department, as are assigned to or under the control of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, or as are deemed by the Secretary of Defense to be necessary or desirable for the operations of the Department of the Air Force or the United States Air Force, shall be transferred to and vested in the Secretary of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force: *Provided*, That the National Guard Bureau shall, in addition to the functions and duties performed by it for the Department of the Army, be charged with similar functions and duties for the Department of the Air Force, and shall be the channel of communication between the Department of the Air Force and the several States on all matters pertaining to the Air National Guard: *And provided further*, That, in order to permit an orderly transfer, the Secretary of Defense may, during the transfer period hereinafter prescribed, direct that the Department of the Army shall continue for appropriate periods to exercise any of such functions, insofar as they relate to the Department of the Air Force, or the United States Air Force or their property and personnel. Such of the property, personnel, and records of the Department of the Army used in the exercise of functions transferred under this subsection as the Secretary of Defense shall determine shall be transferred or assigned to the Department of the Air Force.

"(g) The Secretary of the Air Force shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of the Air Force, of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

"UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

"SEC. 208. (a) The United States Air Force is hereby established under the Department of the Air Force. The Army Air Forces, the Air Corps, United States Army, and the General Headquarters Air Force (Air Force Combat Command), shall be transferred to the United States Air Force.

"(b) There shall be a Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of four years from among the officers of general rank who are assigned to or commissioned in the United States Air Force. Under the direction of the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, shall exercise command over the United States Air Force and shall be charged with the duty of carrying into execution all lawful orders and directions which may be transmitted to him. The functions of the Commanding General, General Headquarters Air Force (Air Force Combat Command), and of the Chief of the Air Corps and of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be transferred to the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. When such transfer becomes effective, the offices of the Chief of the Air Corps, United States Army, and Assistants to the Chief of the Air Corps, United States Army, provided for by the Act of June 4, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 768), and Commanding General, General Headquarters Air Force, provided for by section 5 of the Act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1525), shall cease to exist. While holding office as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, the incumbent shall hold a grade and receive allowances equivalent to those prescribed by law for the Chief of Staff, United States Army. The Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force shall take rank among themselves according to their relative dates of appointment as such, and shall each take rank above all other officers on the active list of the Army, Navy, and Air Force: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall have the effect of changing the relative rank of the present Chief of Staff, United States Army, and the present Chief of Naval Operations.

"(c) All commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, commissioned, holding warrants, or enlisted, in the Air Corps, United States Army, or the Army Air Forces, shall be transferred in branch to the United States Air Force. All other commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, who are commissioned, hold warrants, or are enlisted, in any component of the Army of the United States and who are under the authority or command of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be continued under the authority or command of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, and under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Air Force. Personnel whose status is affected by this subsection shall retain their existing commissions, warrants, or enlisted status in existing components of the armed forces unless otherwise altered or terminated in accordance with existing law; and they shall not be deemed to have been appointed to a new or different office or grade, or to have vacated their permanent or temporary appointments in an existing component of the armed forces, solely by virtue of any change in status under this subsection. No such change in status shall alter or prejudice the status of any individual so assigned, so as to deprive him of any right, benefit, or privilege to which he may be entitled under existing law.

"(d) Except as otherwise directed by the Secretary of the Air Force, all property, records, installations, agencies, activities, projects, and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction, control, authority, or command of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, shall be continued to the same extent under the jurisdiction, control, authority, or command, respectively, of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, in the Department of the Air Force.

"(e) For a period of two years from the date of enactment of this Act, personnel (both military and civilian), property, records, installations, agencies, activities, and projects may be transferred between the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force by direction of the Secretary of Defense.

"(f) In general the United States Air Force shall include aviation forces both combat and service not otherwise assigned. It shall be organized, trained, and equipped primarily

for prompt and sustained offensive and defensive air operations. The Air Force shall be responsible for the preparation of the air forces necessary for the effective prosecution of war except as otherwise assigned and, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of the peacetime components of the Air Force to meet the needs of war.

"EFFECTIVE DATE OF TRANSFERS

"SEC. 209. Each transfer, assignment, or change in status under section 207 or section 208 shall take effect upon such date or dates as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"WAR COUNCIL

"SEC. 210. There shall be within the National Military Establishment a War Council composed of the Secretary of Defense, as Chairman, who shall have power of decision; the Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of the Air Force; the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; and the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. The War Council shall advise the Secretary of Defense on matters of broad policy relating to the armed forces, and shall consider and report on such other matters as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

"SEC. 211. (a) There is hereby established within the National Military Establishment the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which shall consist of the Chief of Staff, United States Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force; and the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, if there be one.

"(b) Subject to the authority and direction of the President and the Secretary of Defense, it shall be the duty of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

"(1) to prepare strategic plans and to provide for the strategic direction of the military forces;

"(2) to prepare joint logistic plans and to assign to the military services logistic responsibilities in accordance with such plans;

"(3) to establish unified commands in strategic areas when such unified commands are in the interest of national security;

"(4) to formulate policies for joint training of the military forces;

"(5) to formulate policies for coordinating the education of members of the military forces;

"(6) to review major material and personnel requirements of the military forces, in accordance with strategic and logistic plans; and

"(7) to provide United States representation on the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

"(c) The Joint Chiefs of Staff shall act as the principal military advisers to the President and the Secretary of Defense and shall perform such other duties as the President and the Secretary of Defense may direct or as may be prescribed by law.

"JOINT STAFF

"SEC. 212. There shall be, under the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Joint Staff to consist of not to exceed one hundred officers and to be composed of approximately equal numbers of officers from each of the three armed services. The Joint Staff, operating under a Director thereof appointed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall perform such duties as may be directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Director shall be an officer junior in grade to all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"MUNITIONS BOARD

"SEC. 213. (a) There is hereby established in the National Military Establishment a Munitions Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board').

"(b) The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary from each of the three military departments, to be designated in each case by the Secretaries of their respective departments. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the Board under the direction of the Secretary of Defense and in support of strategic and logistic plans prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

"(1) to coordinate the appropriate activities within the National Military Establishment with regard to industrial matters, including the procurement, production, and distribution plans of the departments and agencies comprising the Establishment;

"(2) to plan for the military aspects of industrial mobilization;

"(3) to recommend assignment of procurement responsibilities among the several military services and to plan for standardization of specifications and for the greatest practicable allocation of purchase authority of technical equipment and common use items on the basis of single procurement;

"(4) to prepare estimates of potential production, procurement, and personnel for use in evaluation of the logistic feasibility of strategic operations;

"(5) to determine relative priorities of the various segments of the military procurement programs;

"(6) to supervise such subordinate agencies as are or may be created to consider the subjects falling within the scope of the Board's responsibilities;

"(7) to make recommendations to regroup, combine, or dissolve existing interservice agencies operating in the fields of procurement, production, and distribution in such manner as to promote efficiency and economy;

"(8) to maintain liaison with other departments and agencies for the proper correlation of military requirements with the civilian economy, particularly in regard to the procurement or disposition of strategic and critical material and the maintenance of adequate reserves of such material, and to make recommendations as to policies in connection therewith;

"(9) to assemble and review material and personnel requirements presented by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and those presented by the production, procurement, and distribution agencies assigned to meet military needs, and to make recommendations thereon to the Secretary of Defense; and

"(10) to perform such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"(d) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Army and Navy Munitions Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Munitions Board.

"(e) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

"RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

"SEC. 214. (a) There is hereby established in the National Military Establishment a Research and Development Board (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board'). The Board shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and two representatives from each of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, to be designated by the Secretaries of their respective Departments. The Chairman shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year. The purpose of the Board shall be to advise the Secretary of Defense as to the status of scientific research relative to the national security, and to assist him in assuring adequate provision for research and development on scientific problems relating to the national security.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Board, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense—

"(1) to prepare a complete and integrated program of research and development for military purposes;

"(2) to advise with regard to trends in scientific research relating to national security and the measures necessary to assure continued and increasing progress;

"(3) to recommend measures of coordination of research and development among the military departments, and allocation among them of responsibilities for specific programs of joint interest;

"(4) to formulate policy for the National Military Establishment in connection with research and development matters involving agencies outside the National Military Establishment;

"(5) to consider the interaction of research and development and strategy, and to advise the Joint Chiefs of Staff in connection therewith; and

"(6) to perform such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may direct.

"(c) When the Chairman of the Board first appointed has taken office, the Joint Research and Development Board shall cease to exist and all its records and personnel shall be transferred to the Research and Development Board.

"(d) The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as the Secretary may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"COMPENSATION OF SECRETARIES

"SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

"UNDER SECRETARIES AND ASSISTANT SECRETARIES

"SEC. 302. The Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force shall each receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year and shall perform such duties as the Secretaries of their respective departments may prescribe.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND PERSONNEL

"SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and the Director of Central Intelligence are authorized to appoint such advisory committees and to employ, consistent with other provisions of this act, such part-time advisory personnel as they may deem necessary in carrying out their respective functions and the functions of agencies under their control. Persons holding other offices or positions under the United States for which they receive compensation while serving as members of such committees shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other members of such committees and other part-time advisory personnel so employed may serve without compensation or may receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $35 for each day of service, as determined by the appointing authority.

"(b) Service of an individual as a member of any such advisory committee, or in any other part-time capacity for a department or agency hereunder, shall not be considered as service bringing such individual within the provisions of section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, unless the

act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves a department or agency which such person is advising or in which such department or agency is directly interested.

"STATUS OF TRANSFERRED CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

"SEC. 304. All transfers of civilian personnel under this Act shall be without change in classification or compensation, but the head of any department or agency to which such a transfer is made is authorized to make such changes in the titles and designations and prescribe such changes in the duties of such personnel commensurate with their classification as he may deem necessary and appropriate.

"SAVING PROVISIONS

"SEC. 305. (a) All laws, orders, regulations, and other actions applicable with respect to any function, activity, personnel, property, records, or other thing transferred under this Act, or with respect to any officer, department, or agency, from which such transfer is made, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, terminated, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, have the same effect as if such transfer had not been made; but, after any such transfer, any such law, order, regulation, or other action which vested functions in or otherwise related to any officer, department, or agency from which such transfer was made shall, insofar as applicable with respect to the function, activity, personnel, property, records or other thing transferred and to the extent not inconsistent with other provisions of this Act, be deemed to have vested such function in or relate to the officer, department, or agency to which the transfer was made.

"(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any department or agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any transfer or change in title under the provisions of this Act; and, in the case of any such transfer, such suit, action, or other proceeding may be maintained by or against the successor of such head or other officer under the transfer, but only if the court shall allow the same to be maintained on motion or supplemental petition filed within twelve months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain settlement of the questions involved.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of the second paragraph of section 5 of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, the existing organization of the War Department under the provisions of Executive Order Numbered 9082 of February 28, 1942, as modified by Executive Order Numbered 9722 of May 13, 1946, and the existing organization of the Department of the Navy under the provisions of Executive Order Numbered 9635 of September 29, 1945, including the assignment of functions to organizational units within the War and Navy Departments, may, to the extent determined by the Secretary of Defense, continue in force for two years following the date of enactment of this Act except to the extent modified by the provisions of this Act or under the authority of law.

"TRANSFER OF FUNDS

"SEC. 306. All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, nonappropriated funds, or other funds available or hereafter made available for use by or on behalf of the Army Air Forces or officers thereof, shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force for use in connection with the exercise of its functions. Such other unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, nonappropriated funds, or other funds available or hereafter made available for use by the Department of War or the Department of the Army in exercise of functions transferred to the Department of the Air Force under this Act, as the Secretary of Defense shall determine, shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force for use in connection with the exercise of its functions. Unexpended balances transferred under this section may be used for the purposes for which the appropriations, allocations, or other funds were originally made available, or for new expenditures occasioned by the enactment of this Act. The transfers herein authorized may be made with or without warrant action as may be appropriate from time to time from any appropriation covered by this section to any other such appropriation or to such new accounts established on the books of the Treasury as may be determined to be necessary to carry into effect provisions of this Act.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 307. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 308. (a) As used in this Act, the term 'function' includes functions, powers, and duties.

"(b) As used in this Act, the term 'budget program' refers to recommendations as to the apportionment, to the allocation and to the review of allotments of appropriated funds.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 309. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 310. (a) The first sentence of section 202 (a) and sections 1, 2, 307, 308, 309, and 310 shall take effect immediately upon the enactment of this Act.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (a), the provisions of this Act shall take effect on whichever of the following days is the earlier: The day after the day upon which the Secretary of Defense first appointed takes office, or the sixtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY

"SEC. 311. Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 1 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, death, or inability both of the President and Vice President', approved July 18, 1947, is amended by striking out 'Secretary of War' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary of Defense', and by striking out 'Secretary of the Navy,'."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
GEORGE H. BENDER,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
CHET HOLIFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY F. BYRD,
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. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Security Organization, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National Security, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Security Organization, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Security Organization with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, 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 House amendment to the text of the bill strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The bill as agreed to in conference is the same as the House amendment, except for typographical, clerical, and clarifying changes, and the following:

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided (sec. 101 (a)) that the National Security Council be composed of the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense (in the Senate bill designated as "Secretary of National Security"), the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Under the Senate bill the Council was also to be composed of such other members as the President may designate from time to time. Under the bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 101 (a)) the Council, in addition to the members specifically named above, is to be composed of such of the following-named officers as the President may designate from time to time: the Secretaries of the executive departments, the Chairman of the Munitions Board, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board. No such additional member is to be designated until the advice and consent of the Senate has been given to his appointment to the office the holding of which authorizes his designation as a member of the Council. Thus, for example, the Secretary of Commerce now in office could be designated by the President as a member of the Council, but if in the future a new Secretary of Commerce is appointed the new Secretary could not serve as a member of the Council until the advice and consent of the Senate has been given to his appointment to the office of Secretary of Commerce.

The Senate bill (sec. 101 (c)) provided that the Secretary of Defense be director of the staff of the Council. The House amendment (sec. 101 (c)) provided that the Council have a staff headed by a civilian executive secretary to receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 a year. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 101 (c)) is the same as the House amendment except the compensation of the executive secretary is fixed at the rate of $10,000 a year.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The Senate bill provided that the Director of Central Intelligence be appointed from the armed services or from civilian life. The House amendment provided that the Director of Central Intelligence be appointed from civilian life. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 102) provides that the Director shall be appointed from among the commissioned officers of the armed services or from among individuals in civilian life

and adds a new subsection (b) which provides that if a commissioned officer of the armed services is appointed as Director then (1) in the performance of his duties as Director, he is to be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were a civilian in no way connected with the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the armed services or any component thereof; and (2) he is not to possess or exercise any supervision, control, powers, or functions (other than such as he possesses, or is authorized or directed to exercise, as Director) with respect to the armed services or any component thereof, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, or any branch, bureau, unit or division thereof, or with respect to any of the personnel (military or civilian) of any of the foregoing. Except as noted in the preceding sentence the appointment to the office of Director of a commissioned officer of the armed services and his acceptance of and service in such office is in no way to affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the armed services or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade. Also any such commissioned officer, while serving in the office of Director, is to receive the military pay and allowance (active or retired, as the case may be) payable to a commissioned officer of his grade and length of service and is to be paid, from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Central Intelligence Agency, annual compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which $14,000 exceeds the amount of his annual military pay and allowances.

The House amendment (sec. 105 (d)) provided that to the extent recommended by the National Security Council and approved by the President, such intelligence operations of the departments of government as relate to the national security shall be open to the inspection of the Director of Central Intelligence, and such intelligence as relates to national security and is possessed by such departments and other agencies of the Government shall be made available to the Director of Central Intelligence for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination. Section 102 (d) of the bill as agreed to in conference provides that to the extent recommended by the National Security Council and approved by the President, such intelligence of the departments and agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, relating to the national security, shall be open to the inspection of the Director of Central Intelligence, and such intelligence as relates to the national security and is possessed by such departments and other agencies of the Government, except as hereinafter provided, shall be made available to the Director of Central Intelligence for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination; provided, however, that upon the written request of the Director of Central Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall make available to the Director of Central Intelligence such information for correlation, evaluation, and dissemination as may be essential to the national security.

PERSONNEL OF NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Both the Senate bill (sec. 103 (b)) and the House amendment (sec. 106 (b)) authorized the chairman of the National Security Resources Board to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Board in carrying out its functions. The Senate bill provided that such authority be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The House amendment provided that such authority be without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 103 (b)) follows the language of the Senate bill.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Both the Senate bill (sec. 202 (a)) and House amendment (sec. 102 (a)) provided that the new Secretary be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The House amendment contained a proviso (not contained in the Senate bill) providing that a person who has held a commission in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 202 (a)) contains a provision that a person who has within ten years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense.

The Senate bill (sec. 202 (a) (2)) imposed upon the Secretary of Defense the duty to exercise general direction, authority, and control over certain departments and agencies. The House amendment (sec. 102 (a) (2)) added the word "general" before the word "authority" and before the word "control." The words added by the House amendment have been deleted in the bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 202 (a) (2)) as surplusage.

The Senate bill (sec. 202 (a) (3)) imposed upon the Secretary of Defense the duty to formulate and determine the budget estimates for submittal to the Bureau of the Budget. The House amendment contained no such provision. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 202 (a) (4)) contains this provision from the Senate bill.

COMPOSITION AND DUTIES OF THE NAVY AND OF NAVAL AVIATION

The House amendment (sec. 203 (b)) contained language relating specifically to the composition and duties of the United States Navy and of Naval Aviation. The Senate bill (sec. 206 (b)) provided that the provisions of this act shall not authorize the alteration or diminution of the existing relative status of Naval Aviation. The first and last paragraphs of section 206 (b) of the bill as agreed to in conference are the same as the first and last paragraphs of section 203 (b) of the House amendment. The second, third, and fourth paragraphs of section 203 (b) of the House amendment are omitted and the following is inserted in lieu thereof:

"All naval aviation shall be integrated with the naval service as part thereof within the Department of the Navy. Naval aviation shall consist of combat and service and training forces, and shall include land-based naval aviation, air transport essential for naval operations, all air weapons and air techniques involved in the operations and activities of the United States Navy, and the entire remainder of the aeronautical organization of the United States Navy, together with the personnel necessary therefor.

"The Navy shall be generally responsible for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping."

COMPOSITION AND DUTIES OF THE MARINE CORPS

The House amendment (sec. 203) contained the following provision:

"(c) The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include land combat and service forces and such aviation as may be organic therein. The primary mission of the Marine Corps shall be to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign. It shall be the duty of the Marine Corps to develop, in coordination with the Army and the Air Force, those phases of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by landing forces. In addition to its primary mission, the Marine Corps shall provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, shall provide security detachments for the protection of naval property at naval stations and bases, and shall perform such other duties as the President may direct: *Provided*, That such additional duties shall not detract from or interfere with the performance of the primary mission hereinbefore set forth. The Marine Corps shall be responsible, in accordance with integrated joint mobilization plans, for the expansion of peacetime components of the Marine Corps to meet the needs of war."

The Senate bill (sec. 206 (b)) provided that the provisions of this act shall not authorize the alteration or diminution of the existing relative status of the Marine Corps (including the Fleet Marine Forces). The bill as agreed to in conference contains the same language (sec. 206 (c)) as that in the House amendment except that (1) the words "The primary mission of the Marine Corps shall be" at the beginning of the second sentence are changed to read "The Marine Corps shall be organized, trained, and equipped"; (2) the words "to its primary mission" at the beginning of the fourth sentence are omitted; and (3) the words "performance of the primary mission hereinbefore set forth" in the proviso at the end of the fourth sentence are omitted and in lieu thereof the words "operations for which the Marine Corps is primarily organized" are inserted.

COMPENSATION OF SECRETARIES

The Senate bill (sec. 302 (b)) provided that the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each receive the compensation prescribed for the Secretary of Defense. The House amendment (sec. 301 (b)) provided that these three Secretaries shall each receive compensation at the rate of $14,500 a year. The bill as agreed to in conference (sec. 301 (b)) provides that these three Secretaries shall each receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
GEORGE H. BENDER,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
CHET HOLIFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously no quorum is present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 131]

Barden	Hall,	Norton
Bell	Edwin Arthur	O'Toole
Bland	Harness, Ind.	Pfeifer
Bloom	Hart	Philbin
Buckley	Hartley	Phillips, Calif.
Bulwinkle	Hays	Poulson
Butler	Hébert	Powell
Cannon	Heffernan	Rabin
Carroll	Hendricks	Rayfiel
Case, S. Dak.	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Jenison	Rooney
Chelf	Jenkins, Pa.	Sabath
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Sadowski
Clements	Jones, N. C.	Sarbacher
Cole, Mo.	Jones, Wash.	Smith, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Somers
Cox	Kefauver	Stigler
Dawson, Ill.	Kelley	Taylor
Dawson, Utah	Kennedy	Thomason
Dingell	Keogh	Tollefson
Domengeaux	Klein	Trimble
Durham	Lesinski	Vail
Elsaesser	Ludlow	Vinson
Fellows	Lynch	Welch
Fernandez	McCowen	Williams
Fuller	McDowell	Wood
Gathings	Macy	Worley
Gifford	Marcantonio	Youngblood
Gore	Mason	Zimmerman
Gossett	Meade, Md.	
Gregory	Norrell	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 340 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain that request at this time. Perhaps later in the day the Chair may be able to, but not now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that during the time of adjournment the vacation of Congress, so-called, which is always to the individual Members a period of extra work and overtime, you all will have a pleasant time with the folks at home.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, which is H. R. 4214, under the number S. 758, to my mind, is as important as any that could come before the Congress. There is no question but that we need unification. All admit that in all preparations for national defense or for war there has been inexcusable duplication and waste. War is waste and destruction.

My reluctance to vote for legislation of this kind grows not out of the fact that it is not needed but that for some 25 years certain individuals connected with the Joint Staff have been seeking not only to give the Nation unity in its preparations for defense and for war and greater efficiency, but that some of those pushing it seek to open the door to the establishment of a military dictatorship. Not only does the General Staff want to give us greater efficiency but as indicated by the terms of this bill they want the power to plan our domestic as well as our foreign policy. When you read the bill you will discover that that is the fact. All too often these planners become the ones with authority and carry out their plans as distinguished from the plans of the Congress.

And so there may arise in your minds the question as to why I support it, and I can only repeat what I said in the beginning when this bill was before us for the first time. It is the lesser of two evils. Apparently we are going to pass—I may say it is evident we are going to pass—some legislation on this subject, and may I respectfully submit to you and to your judgment that the bill that your committee brought back, the bill just returned by the conferees to this House, is a great improvement over the original bill, and the best we can get at this time. That is why the conferees bring it back for your consideration.

In this bill you will find provisions that make it necessary that future Congresses will be required, if our liberty is to be preserved, to guard against the planning of the State Department and the military in this country with reference to foreign policies, with reference to domestic economy, with reference to the dissipation of our resources and our production, our industrial plants, because, as we all know, in these days the planning is more than half the battle; and when they bring planned or planning legislation here to Congress—when it relates to foreign policy or domestic policy the Congress has been all too willing, for what reason I know not, to accept, adopt, and carry it out.

Now to touch the provisions of this bill, the points on which your conferees could not carry out your wishes to the extent which they desired. Distinguished gentlemen from the other end of the Capitol had something to say about it. They had quite a lot to say about it.

You will recall that when the House passed on this legislation it amended the bill H. R. 4214, which the committee reported, with reference to the Central Intelligence Agency. The committee had written into the bill a provision that the head of that agency might be a civilian or a man from the armed services. The House amended the bill to provide that he shall be a civilian. During the debate the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] offered an amendment which provided that if a man from the armed services was appointed he should be required to relinquish his rank and his authority in the Army.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when we went into conference, the conferees for the other body flatly refused to accept that amendment. They had made certain concessions to which your attention will be called later on, but on that one they stood pat. They refused to accept the House amendment to the committee bill so your conferees compromised by accepting the language of the bill, 4214, as reported by your committee to the House, thus discarding the amendment written into the bill by the House which would have required that the head of that agency be a civilian. My own choice, and I think the choice of six of the seven members of the House subcommittee who were conferees, was that the head of that agency should be a civilian, but we could not get it, so we went along with that compromise. It seeks to divorce the head of the agency from the armed services if a man in the service is appointed.

It will be recalled also, if you have read the hearings, that there was a deliberate effort on the part of the Army part of the Joint Staff to reduce the marines to the status of a police force. Your committee, and the House sustained its action, wrote into the bill certain provisions which protect the marines. You may just as well talk about stopping the sunrise or the setting of the sun as to think that the people of this country are going to permit the Congress to vote to get rid of the marines. The marines have fought their way into the hearts of all the people, and the conferees who were opposed to the provisions which protected them could get nowhere. In my humble judgment, this bill protects to the fullest extent the marines, their activities, their role, their missions, their rights to develop the kind of warfare and weapons they think are necessary or of advantage to the country.

There was fear on the part of some who had been in the Navy as to certain omissions in the original bill as sent up by the administration. You will recall that the men who fought as admirals, vice admirals, rear admirals, men who fought in the last war as captains, and officers of lower rank, some of them having had their ships blown out from under them, did not get an opportunity to appear before the committee to express their thoughts and their ideas as to what the legislation should be. You will recall that 4 or 5 days before the hearings were ended, and they were closed in spite of my protest, there were two orders of the Navy, 94 and 95, which prevented the fighting men and officers in the Navy, except as their views were channeled through the Secretary of the Navy from expressing their opinions. That gag was only removed a few days before the hearing ended. It was then impossible to call those witnesses. So there was a justifiable fear on the part of the enlisted men in the Navy and on the part of the officers of the Navy that an attempt was being made to take from them naval aviation.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] offered an amendment in the House, and it was adopted, which in our opinion and apparently in the opinion of the Members of the House protected the Navy by permitting it to continue to have naval aviation.

We had to make some changes in the phraseology of that amendment as written in by the House. But again, in my judgment, there is no change in the basic thought; there is no change in the language that will prevent the Navy from carrying out to the fullest extent its desire to be adequately protected in time of war by naval aviation and to develop before war comes naval aviation.

Those were the three more important points in the legislation as it went to conference. First was the appointment of the head of the Central Intelligence. We had to guard against a gestapo, and we wrote in there a provision which we

think now will do that. Then there was the protection to be given to the marines and there was the protection to be given to naval aviation. We have both in the bill as it comes back from conference. So, on the whole, if we must have a bill—and we must—it is here. We do most humbly and respectfully submit this bill for your consideration and action. My only purpose in calling attention to the dangers the bill carries is this: It opens the door to military dictatorship and renders more burdensome the duty of future Congresses to adequately protect us from government by the armed services. All in all, inasmuch as the Congress is determined to pass a bill, this is the best we can get, and it is if the powers granted are not extended and if the organizations set up by it are content to remain within the written provisions of the bill, not too bad.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am overwhelmed by the continued generosity of my distinguished chairman. My friend the gentleman from Michigan has referred to the Director of Central Intelligence, and I think I might advise the House that that was the last question that we passed upon in conference. The Senate accepted the House provision of the bill as reported out of the House committee.

You will remember when the bill was on the floor we frankly advised the Committee of the Whole at that time that the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was strongly inclined toward, if not favorable to, a civilian director, but in view of the immediate situation that confronted us we put in the provision that in case a military man, a career officer of the Army or the Navy, was appointed that he would have to occupy what would be, in effect, a civilian position. We tried to protect him so that he would be free from a dual influence. I recognize, if one were to argue or say it did not completely eliminate a dual influence, that I could not challenge that statement. But we did the best we could from a human angle. We felt, since enabling legislation was going to come in later from another standing committee of the House—and we know that; we were advised and saw a copy of the proposed bill—that that question, with the other questions that would arise in connection with this Central Intelligence Agency, should be left to the standing committee, and that our committee should try to meet the immediate problem. The bill as it comes back is substantially the House bill. I think it is a much better bill—and I agree on that with my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]—than any of the bills that were considered by the committees of both branches and an improvement upon the bill that passed the Senate. It is now a bill that probably expresses in the most effective way possible the collective action to a satisfied extent of the membership of the House and the Senate.

This bill is one of the most controversial problems that came up in Congress at the outset of this session, and we have seen it go through the House practically without any opposition. The House is now ready to accept the conference report. I think this is a strong indication of the confidence the House has in the considerations of the House committee and in the bill the House committee reported.

One of the most controversial problems and consequently one of the last to be resolved was the question of providing in legislation a reasonable assurance that the Marine Corps and naval aviation would continue to perform their proper functions in the National Military Establishment after unification. Fears were expressed, and honest fears, that an attempt to describe in detail the composition of forces, and their functions and missions might introduce an inflexibility which would impair the effectiveness of the armed forces.

Your committee recognized these fears, and while they considered it desirable to provide in general terms for the continued functioning of these two elements of the armed services, it was not their intent to create a statutory rigidity which would be a bar to future progress. By the same token, it is not their intent by this act to freeze the organization of the armed forces, or the concept of military operations, since a major purpose of the act is to assure that scientific progress shall be reflected in a progressive and dynamic organization. It is in no way the intent of the committee to tie the hands of the Secretary of Defense in any manner which would prevent the increased economies and the enhanced efficiency which the people of the United States have a right to expect. Further, nothing in this act should be construed as infringing upon the traditional and constitutional authority of the President as Commander in Chief.

The bill permits broad flexibility in administration and in operation in all of its aspects, and should be construed in the future from that angle. Under no conditions, either directly or indirectly, even if we had the power to do so, does it infringe upon or invade the powers of the President, as President or as Commander in Chief. This is clearly the intent of the Congress.

We have now come to the final legislative stage in this very important and far-reaching piece of legislation. It shows what the processes of legislative action under constitutional government are. As we look back through the months we recollect the fears that were expressed, and some properly so, then we recollect the evidence considered in hearings and the fears taken into account. Then the bill went through the legislative processes, and has finally come down to this final legislative stage, and we now find a feeling of abiding satisfaction that the bill represents the best that can be done at this time in connection with legislation along the lines outlined therein.

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

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I concur in what the gentleman has said. As the gentleman knows, I personally think it is a mistake not to require that the Director of Central Intelligence be a civilian, but I am sure that on the whole the bill is in excellent shape and that the majority of the provisions for which the House committee voted and which it believes to be right have been written into the bill. I think the committee is to be congratulated.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I thank the gentleman. I think the House can accept the statement of the chairman, in which I concur, that the conferees on the part of the House are able to report back to the House that the substance of the changes made by the House committee are contained in the bill.

It has been a pleasure to me to work with all of the members of the committee on this bill. Every Member approached this problem with an open mind, no matter what party he belongs to. The members of the conference committee, both of the House and of the Senate, did likewise. There were no difficulties at any time. We went into the thing very carefully. It is a bill which through able and courageous administration will produce efficiency and economy in our armed services, and will make stronger our future national security.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of the Department of State. Because of my long-time respect and admiration for Gen. George C. Marshall, the Secretary of State, this is indeed a grevious thing to have to do.

However, under circumstances outlined to me in great detail with respect to State Department action—or, I should say, lack of action—on behalf of an American citizen, I think it is apparent that there is no other recourse than to have the matter in question fully investigated. I am confident that every Member of Congress who familiarizes himself with the problem will agree as to the validity of my decision.

The resolution, Mr. Speaker, calls for investigation of the State Department's action with reference to the rights of an American citizen to protection under the provisions of the arbitration treaty between our Nation and the Government of Guatemala. This treaty requires the submission to arbitration of claims of American citizens against the Government of Guatemala. The individual in question—a man by the name of Soto—has been refused such arbitration by the State Department. I can see no valid

reason for it; I am advised that there are reasons therefor, but reasons which will not stand up under investigation.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this man's claim has been pending since 1929—all of this time in the State Department. It has been twice approved by the Legal Department of the State Department. Moreover, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate passed a resolution declaring that this American citizen is entitled to arbitration under the treaty in question. The State Department's failure to act has been questioned by myself and Senators WILEY, BUTLER, and JENNER, and, as I have stated before, in effect has been questioned by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Nothing has come of it. It is, I submit, time to act.

Now, let me say here that I do not know Mr. Soto. The results of the matter do not bear upon me personally in any respect, politically or otherwise. I am totally disinterested in the problem from any standpoint other than the obtaining of redress for an American citizen who, from all available facts, is certainly entitled thereto. I further submit that it is the duty of the Congress to exert its power for the protection of the rights of our citizens. And if it appears—as it definitely does—that the legal department of the State Department is so engrossed in other matters that it not only neglects but refuses to maintain and protect the rights of our own citizens, at a time when we are being called upon to assist the plight of foreign nationals, then, I say, Mr. Speaker, that something effective must be done.

For this reason, I have offered a resolution today to require a thoroughgoing investigation of this claim, not only in fairness to this American citizen by the name of Soto, but because of the possibility, if this matter has been grossly mishandled, of similar action having been taken in other instances involving our own citizens. I earnestly request that whichever committee of the House of Representatives receives my resolution will follow the matter to its conclusion. I am personally confident that an investigation is fully warranted. It should get under way with the least possible delay.

(The resolution referred to is as follows:)

Resolved, That the Committee on ————, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of the action of the Department of State with respect to the claim of George B. Soto, a native-born American citizen, against the Government of Guatemala, amounting to approximately $3,000,000, which has been pending in the Department of State since 1929; to ascertain why the agreement made by Guatemala with the Department of State to arbitrate this claim in 1932 was not carried out by the Department of State; to ascertain why, when the claim was approved as valid and meritorious by the legal department and the counselor of the Department of State in 1938 and 1940, and dispatches sent to Guatemala demanding settlement of the claim in June 1941, such claim should by October 1941 become not valid and not meritorious and be dropped by the Department of State after Guatemala had made two offers of cash payments of the claim, thereby admitting liability under the claim; to ascertain whether or not the dropping of the Soto claim by the Department of State was involved in the securing of the cooperation of Guatemala in the Presidential freezing order issued in July 1941, and before Guatemala was at war with Germany and Japan; to ascertain the liability of the United States Government for the payment of this claim if the claim has been used by the Government for its own purposes, and, if so, to provide for payment of the claim out of Department of State appropriations, if, by the failure of the Department of State to act, the liability has been fixed by the Department of State on the United States Government; to ascertain and determine whether the legal rights of an American citizen under the Pecuniary Claims Convention of Buenos Aires of 1910 to arbitration of the claim can be denied by the Department of State.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) within 120 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, dispatches, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

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

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MATHEWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I make another appeal for action by this House on legislation that is urgently needed for the veterans before Congress adjourns. I have urged especially that action be taken before adjournment on pending legislation, already approved by the Senate, to increase subsistence allowances to students under the GI bill. I again earnestly request that the majority leadership give favorable consideration to that.

In the extension of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation recently the authority to purchase GI loan paper was left out over the protest and votes of many of us and I think that experience has shown, and will show, that this was a mistake. I note the Senate has just passed a bill to give such authority to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation again. Legislation is pending in this House to do the same. I earnestly appeal to the majority leadership not to adjourn this Congress until that legislation is also passed.

There are other items of veterans' legislation pending which I do not have time to discuss in the time given me but which I hope the leadership will give consideration to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I am advised by the Public Printer that the extension exceeds the amount allowed and will cost $177.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes today.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently made by Dr. Thorning, and in another instance to include an article appearing in the American Watch Worker.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted I may address the House for 15 minutes today.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

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

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects.

Mr. FOLGER and Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article in the Republican News of July 1947.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a paper on reparations.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include letters and a clipping.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Spyros P. Skouras.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD. It may slightly exceed the cost as prescribed, but I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding that fact I may be granted that permission.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the additional cost, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the other special orders today, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to entertain such a request at this time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Are we not allowed to talk about the Kansas City investigation?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman can get time he can talk about anything he wants to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to entertain requests for 1-minute speeches at this time.

MANUFACTURERS OF WAR MATERIALS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution providing for the appointment of a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House to conduct a study and review of the activities of those manufacturers of war materials during World War II who materially contributed to the war effort of the United States and her allies. The committee would also recommend that a suitable form of recognition, comparable to citations awarded to members of the armed services, be awarded to manufacturers for the valuable services they performed to this country and our allies. As a result of investigations conducted by either congressional committeees or private citizens, too many of these loyal citizens who did such a remarkable job in helping us to win this war are now being criticized for political or other reasons. Many innocent people are being accused of having made exorbitant profits or having produced inferior matériel, which is not based on the facts. No one can deny that without the valuable aid given by the majority of manufacturers of war matériel we might not have won the war, or at least it might have been prolonged. Scientists and others who perfected the atomic bomb and manufacturers of ships, tanks, munitions, and other types of war matériel should be commended by some public recognition for the great service they rendered to their country. It is the purpose of my resolution to create a committee which would go into this whole field and report to the Congress giving the names of the outstanding manufacturers who would be commended in some form recommended by the committee.

TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROLS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

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

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 joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, 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 amendment of the House to the text of the joint resolution and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That after November 1, 1947, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 8843, and no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised after such date except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER CAPEHART,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
JOHN BRICKER,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
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 joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, 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 joint resolution authorized the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to continue to exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843 until December 31, 1947, with the proviso that no such regulations should fix a maximum maturity of installment credit of less than 24 months or require a down payment in excess of 20 percent of the purchase price. It further provided that except during any war beginning after December 31, 1947, or any national emergency proclaimed by the President after such date, no such consumer credit controls should be exercised after such date.

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate joint resolution after the enacting clause and inserted an amendment in the nature of a substitute providing that after the date of enactment of the joint resolution the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843 and, except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of the joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of the joint resolution, no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised hereafter.

The substitute agreed to in conference provides that after November 1, 1947, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843, and that no such consumer credit controls shall be exercised after such date except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

The House recedes from its amendment to the title.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the Senate re-

ceded with an amendment, the amendment being that the language of the House bill is accepted in its entirety except that the effective date is November 1, 1947, instead of the date of the enactment of the resolution.

The only difference is that consumer credit controls under the conference agreement will be continued to November 1, 1947, instead of the date of the enactment of the resolution as provided in the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report of the conferees. I think it is a very happy solution of the disagreements existing between the two Houses.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

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

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. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs, 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 amendment of the House numbered 1 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The United States or any State or local public agency assisted by Federal funds made available with respect to housing shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations (except as provided in the proviso of section 209 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947) operated by it where such action or proceeding is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such accommodations are administered, but no such action or proceeding shall be maintained prior to March 1, 1948, if in the opinion of the administering authority such action or proceeding would result in undue hardship for the occupants of such housing accommodations, or unless in the opinion of such authority other housing facilities are available for such occupants."

And the House agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOE MCCARTHY,
J. WM. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
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. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The first section of the Senate bill added a new subsection (6) to section 15 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 providing in part that notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (5) or of any other section of such act the Authority is authorized to make capital grants, loans, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing or slum-clearance projects, in the full amount of any sums previously allocated, to any public housing agency, at the request of such agency, upon condition that such agency will pay, or cause to be paid, by the State or political subdivision, the difference between the cost limitations prescribed in subsection (5) and the actual cost of construction per family dwelling unit or per room during the period of building construction. The House amendment modified this provision so as to provide that the amount to be so paid, or caused to be paid, should be such proportion of the total development cost of the project as the amount of the average actual cost per family dwelling unit of the items covered by the applicable cost limitations prescribed in subsection (5) in excess thereof bears to such average actual cost; and a proviso was added to the effect that the amount of any such payment should be excluded from the base on which the maximum amount of any capital grants, loans, or annual contributions authorized by such act are calculated. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment added to the bill a section 2 which inserted at the end of the second sentence of section 2 (1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 a proviso prohibiting the Federal Public Housing Authority and all officers and employees thereof, during the period from the time of taking effect of the proviso until February 29, 1948, (1) from initiating or maintaining any action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations administered by such Authority, if such action or proceeding is based upon the fact that the income of the occupants of such housing accommodations exceeds the allowable maximum, and (2) from in any manner requiring any State or local public housing agency to take any action to recover possession of any housing accommodations administered by such agency, if the basis for requiring the State or local public housing agency to take such action is the fact that the income of the occupants of such housing accommodations exceeds the allowable maximum, unless other adequate housing facilities are available for said occupants. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The committee of conference have agreed upon a substitute for the House section which provides that the United States or any State or local public agency assisted by Federal funds made available with respect to housing shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations (except as provided in the proviso of sec. 209 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947) operated by it where such action or proceeding is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such accommodations are administered, but no such action or proceeding shall be maintained prior to March 1, 1948, if in the opinion of the administering authority such action or proceeding would result in undue hardship for the occupants of such housing accommodations, or unless in the opinion of such authority other housing facilities are available for such occupants.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the only matter in controversy before the conferees was the provision in respect to the eviction of tenants in public housing projects. The conference agreed to certain changes which amount to about the same thing as provided in the House bill except that there is some discretion on the part of the Administrator in respect to ousters.

At the present time there are many tenants of the public housing projects who are not eligible as tenants because their income is higher than that allowed by statute. During the war they were not evicting any of these families, of course.

Under the basic law the Administrator is compelled to evict tenants who become ineligible for occupancy because of an increase in income. This amendment is to somewhat soften those practices, but at the same time makes it possible for persons of low income who are intended to be tenants to eventually occupy the projects. For that reason, and notwithstanding the provisions of basic law, we have given the Administrator the authority to evict them unless he finds that there are no facilities for them and unless he finds that undue hardship would result from the ouster. In other words, we authorize the eviction but only when there are facilities to which the people may move.

Mr. Speaker, the report is signed by all the managers on the part of the House and I think it is a very sensible compromise between the Senate and House positions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the conference report is an improvement on the

bill as passed by the House and I hope it will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. The discretion then rests with the local Housing Authority, the local administering authority, is that the fact?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; in substance that is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. This discretion continues until March 1, 1948, only?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. KEAN. It gives them 6 months.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it seems this is entirely inconsistent with the whole philosophy of Government housing, which is to clean out slums and to protect and help the low-income group. The result is to ignore the basic philosophy, is it not?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would not say it ignores the basic philosophy, because the tenants are paying an economic rent. These people of high income are not paying the low rent, they are paying an economic rent, but we have a condition here whereby during the war these people were literally frozen into these projects. We could not move them, because of lack of facilities, and we have not whipped the housing shortage yet. Now, we hope to do so by March 1 of next year, when we hope it will be perfectly safe for all of the high-income people to be moved from these projects to make room for the people of low income. That program will be gradually carried out so that there will not be too much of a shock or inconvenience to the individuals affected. Instead of ousting them all immediately, we provide for their eviction according to a well-defined program between now and March 1.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the 5 minutes. I think I may in a minute or two suggest what I believe is a very good step in getting some brick laid, so far as housing is concerned. It is furthermore a good step, because it is not a completely Federal controlled project. For the first time now in some of these slum clearing housing projects we are encouraging the municipalities to come in and provide funds, and I am very proud of the fact that the city of Milwaukee has taken the lead in itself providing funds to activate this slum clearance program. I believe a number of other cities that have projects of slum clearance similarly planned will follow suit. It is an excellent example of Federal, municipal, and local cooperation on a slum clearance project, and in that respect I think it is a concrete step forward in getting some housing now when housing is sorely needed in the larger cities.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman that it is necessary to clean up some of the slums in the cities. There is no more important place than right here in Washington. Is there anything in this bill that contemplates that it be done immediately before we get these houses built for veterans?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. No; there is nothing there that will interfere with the homes for veterans whatsoever. These are all projects that have been planned. Contracts have been let, and they have not been able to proceed because the law as it now stands does not permit them to go ahead on account of the ceiling fixed by the law. This conference bill permits the municipality to provide that excess amount that is necessary in view of the rising cost to proceed with the project.

Mr. RICH. At the time they think best, or are they to go at this immediately?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. At the time they think best, but of course, they all fill an important immediate need.

Mr. RICH. We grant the need, but they still have a place to live, whereas in the case of the ex-servicemen, they do not have any place, and they want to take care of them first and then go ahead with these slum clearances.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. There is no doubt about that; that the veterans are in great need of a housing program, and everything should be done to provide veteran housing now. This bill demonstrates the use of Federal and municipal help on levels where it should be done, in slum clearance and pertaining to low income groups.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman, in the final analysis, if this so-called housing shortage has not got to be solved by the desire on the part of the people to build homes for themselves?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is exactly right, and primarily by the desire and the activity of the people in their respective localities, and this bill points in that direction. It points toward the activity on the part of local communities and engages them where formerly they were not.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not have reference to local home ownership. I want the individual to own the house, and if we will get him to encourage that desire, then we will not be confronted by the kind of emergencies we had up for discussion the other day as the result of the housing outfit not selling these houses to established individuals.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The gentleman has made an excellent suggestion, because it is the individual who must take the first step ordinarily, to build his own home, because we know of his great anxiety in that regard.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is it not a fact that we find many veterans in these so-called slum clearance projects, and this measure will provide decent houses for veterans who are unfortunately living in slums today?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is exactly true. It will help those veterans likewise. The city of Milwaukee, Wis., has taken the lead in the Nation to activate this slum clearance program that will affect many cities throughout our country. Milwaukee takes this lead in housing as she has in so many other ways, in crime prevention, in safety, in the health and welfare of its citizens. The reason for this is because the people of Milwaukee have a strong spirit of independence of mind, initiative and sense of public responsibility. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROPHY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and myself have supported this legislation. Officials of the city of Milwaukee like Assistant City Attorney John Decker have worked hard and earnestly to secure its passage. This legislation deserves the support of every Member of this House because it shows a healthy trend toward State and Federal cooperation in the clearance of slums from our urban centers. This is not a fantastic scheme. It is making it possible by the help of the municipalities to start excavating, laying foundation and brick and putting roofs over the heads of people who would otherwise be living in the hovels of urban slums.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOBLICK].

Mr. SCOBLICK. Mr. Speaker, the approval of the proposed amendment to the United States National Housing Act of 1937 is incumbent upon us, for it provides the means for additional housing in this Nation at a time when homes are most needed; when we have funds appropriated that are being tied up because of the increased costs of construction; when we have expended large sums for the beginning of housing projects, which remain dormant; when the solution of these problems can be met with the adoption of this amendment.

I urge the adoption of this amendment and base my decision on a situation of which I am personally informed. There are many housing projects which were sponsored under the United States National Housing Act of 1937 that are incompleted throughout the Nation. In the city of Scranton, Pa., which is located in my district, there was begun before World War II a project known as Valley View Terrace. This project was initiated under the Housing Act of 1937. Over $300,000 of Government funds have been invested in its construction; there remains appropriated and unexpended almost $700,000 of United States funds for its completion.

In the meantime, what was described at the passage of the act as a crisis in housing in the Nation has now increased to larger proportions.

The virtual suspension of repairs and building in home construction for the past 7 years has extended the housing

crisis to a highly acute and almost shameful situation. World War II veterans, who have returned from round the world, anticipating a normal life, with the necessities of life and a few luxuries available to them in this land of ours, have found themselves without independent shelters to set up housekeeping with the wives they left behind, or the sweethearts they came home to and married.

In the instance of Valley View Terrace at Scranton, there is partial construction of a development that will provide, when completed 240 homes. This, of course, will not solve the housing shortage in this area by any means, but it will indeed be of great help and reduce by 240 families, those who are seeking independent shelters.

The United States Government has a huge investment in Valley View Terrace as it has in many other similar projects. It is poor economy to let such invested funds rot on the ground; it is poor government that does not lead the way to relieve discomfort and inconveniences that have resolved upon its men and women who fought in defense of their country.

This amendment will pave the way for the completion of these projects, and without the appropriation of additional United States Government funds.

With building costs having risen higher and beyond original estimates, this amendment provides the respective housing authorities that have been set up for the construction and operation of these projects to take measures to finance any additional costs that have developed because of higher construction costs.

In the instance of Valley View Terrace, I am informed that the Scranton housing authority, once provision is made, is prepared to finance the costs that will accrue above and beyond the appropriated funds.

With authority, vested in them by this amendment, to provide the wherewithal for the completion of Valley View Terrace, I respectfully urge the Members of Congress to pass this amendment and take a long step in the solution of the housing problem in Scranton and throughout the Nation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further requests for time, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 317) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiry to be conducted by the Committee on Agriculture, or subcommittees thereof, as authorized by H. Res. 298, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of attorneys, experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$25,000."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I have about 15 resolutions from the Committee on House Administration. They are all privileged; they are all unanimously reported, I think, and they all explain themselves.

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

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

FASCISM IN ACTION

Mr. PATMAN. I am getting many inquiries about the publication of the booklet on Fascism in Action. May I ask the chairman of the committee if the committee expects to report out the resolution which would permit the printing of 100,000 additional copies for distribution by the Members? Under the present situation each Member will get only one copy. Naturally more requests than that will be received. In order to supply these requests, under the present situation the Members will be compelled to purchase these documents from the Government Printing Office, and I am advised they will cost 40 cents per copy. I am hopeful that the gentleman's committee will report out the resolution to allow a reasonable number, at least, to be printed for distribution by the Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The Subcommittee on Printing took up the gentleman's resolution for the printing of 100,000 copies of Fascism in Action but had no estimate of the cost and took no action on that resolution at this time. The full committee will probably not be in session again during this session.

Mr. PATMAN. I have found out how much it would cost. It would cost $91.50 per thousand if printed when the Government Printing Office supply is printed.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. We have had enough hand-outs to Members of Congress, and we do not want any more books at 40 cents a copy to be given them for nothing. If the Members want more than their allotment, they ought to pay for them.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This resolution will be before the committee at the next session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the committee amendment and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4002. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3045. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAIN, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. MCGRATH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUCK, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4069. An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 303) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 141, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 259) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigations and surveys authorized by House Resolution 211, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Public Works acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $30,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 331) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations, authorized by House Resolution 295, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $125,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 332) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expense of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 296, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $125,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this provides for the expenses of the select committee which was provided for in the resolution adopted by the House 2 days ago.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Is that the resolution known as the Herter resolution?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think it is known as the Herter resolution.

Mr. SABATH. That will investigate conditions covered by the resolution that we just passed for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The resolution with reference to the Committee on Foreign Affairs is entirely separate and apart from the so-called Herter resolution.

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether any evidence has been given before your committees as to whether these two committees will not really overlap.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Their activities will not overlap, I am advised.

One committee is appointed to look into the political conditions in Europe and around the world perhaps, and the other committee will more likely direct its investigations to economic conditions.

Mr. SABATH. Has that committee already been appointed?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think that the Speaker in his wisdom has not yet appointed that committee, but I am not advised as to that at the moment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the members of the committee have not yet been selected.

Mr. SABATH. I trust that the Speaker in his wisdom will appoint a committee that will not be lopsided and which will give the minority adequate representation. The resolution did not provide for that.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I have supreme confidence in the Speaker that he will see there is a fair distribution of the appointees and that able men and women are selected for that investigation.

Mr. SABATH. This cost $125,000?

Mr. LECOMPTE. And that is considerably less than the committee asked for.

Mr. SABATH. The other resolution called for $125,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Considerably less than they asked for.

Mr. SABATH. The three resolutions that we passed before called for $25,000, $30,000, and $50,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman has several other resolutions to provide for these committees?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I have.

Mr. SABATH. How much will all of these investigations that are provided for, that you are going to ask appropriations for, amount to? Can the gentleman give the House the figure?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I can give you all the figures. Do you want the figures for the whole session or just today?

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman has those figures, I think it would be useful to the Members. Otherwise, overstatements and misstatements may be made. So that if we have the actual amounts that have been appropriated, I think it will serve the membership well to explain that it is not over two or three million, as some people have stated. I, myself, thought it would be under a million dollars.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It will be right at a million dollars.

Mr. SABATH. But I believe I was close to the figures even before these resolutions were reported. I think we will appreciate it if the gentleman will give the figures for the cost of all these investigations.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We have authorized investigations to the amount of $632,204.03 up to this morning. There are approximately $400,000 worth of authorizations or approvals in this morning's list of resolutions, which makes it around $1,000,000, but considerably less than the total amount of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. SABATH. But will the gentleman state that it will be over a million dollars?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Just a trifle over a millon dollars, but very little of that money is expended yet.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is there anything in any of these investigations that will investigate the crookedness of this last election at Kansas City; to find out just exactly what is going on out there? They are trying to block every investigation. I think we ought to have something to let the American people know just how crooked that election was, and the American people deserve to know what it was.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman can offer a resolution.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. How many resolutions of inquiry emanated from the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Only one.

Mr. CELLER. Was there one previous to the one the gentleman just spoke of?

Mr. LECOMPTE. No, sir; not for investigation.

Mr. CELLER. I wondered whether or not there are enough members of the Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct all these tours.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Well, one is for a select committee and one is for the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Of course, the Speaker will name the members of the select committee.

Mr. CELLER. Has the gentleman examined the history of the Reorganization Act and its purposes? Was not the Reorganization Act to discourage so many members on junkets, I might call them?

Mr. LECOMPTE. These resolutions have been approved by the House.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. Is it not a fact that the committee was very conservative in its consideration of the requests of the various committees in perhaps approving only about 50 percent of those requests?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Only about 50 percent of the requests; the gentleman is correct on that.

Mr. BURLESON. I believe the gentleman will agree that it is hardly the prerogative and responsibility of the

Committee on House Administration to go behind the scenes of various committees and determine whether or not the investigations are necessary.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Emphatically so.

Mr. BURLESON. The Committee on House Administration cannot anticipate all of the actions of the investigating committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The House approved the resolution providing for the investigation and then requests come to this committee for the money to cover their expenses. Their request is scrutinized carefully and in many cases cut down 50 percent.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. As a Member of the House who is violently opposed to some of these foreign policies, I believe it is high time the Committee on Foreign Relations informed itself, and I believe this expenditure is one of the wisest that could be granted by the House.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 238, to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KNUTSON, REED of New York, WOODRUFF, COOPER, and MILLS.

TERMINATING CERTAIN TAX PROVISIONS BEFORE THE END OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. KNUTSON, REED of New York, WOODRUFF, COOPER, and MILLS.

EXTENDING SECOND-CLASS MAIL PRIVILEGES TO CERTAIN STATE AGENCIES

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2857) to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. REES, TWYMAN, and LYLE.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY RULE XI (1) (h) INCURRED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 333) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to publicity and propaganda in the Government departments and agencies authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $10,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY RULE XI (1) (h) INCURRED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 334) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to the disposition of surplus property authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $15,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 111

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 335) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 111, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee not to exceed $25,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. This committee had $50,000 before and have expended that $50,000, is that correct?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Forty thousand dollars, not all expended.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Not all expended?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now we are appropriating for them $25,000 more?

Mr. LECOMPTE. They have extensive investigations in mind and they also have a number of requests for investigation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. For instance, I understand they are talking about a trip out to Hollywood, is that right?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think the chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts, and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Accounts, can justify this expenditure for the gentleman very easily.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think it ought to be justified to the Congress.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I may say for the benefit of the House that this committee was granted $40,000 of which it has spent about $15,000, leaving about $25,000. We are going to be in recess for at least 5 months. Certain investigations have been asked by the public. The committee has made its plan and in order to follow out the program for the next 5 months and not run out of funds, the Committee on Accounts cut them from an original budget of $75,000 down to an additional $25,000, merely to carry on for the 5 months during adjournment of the Congress.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want to point out one thing that I think is very significant. As I understand it, this committee is to go out to Hollywood and make an investigation along the same lines and of the same nature another committee of the House made. The Committee on Un-American Activities went out to investigate labor in Hollywood. The Committee on Un-American

Activities did practically the same thing and made investigations along the same line. Some of these investigations, in my opinion, do nothing more nor less than add fuel to the building up of scare headlines in order to develop hysteria against labor in this country.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the House has authorized these investigations. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURES FOR THE DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 264 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Document Numbered 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, entitled "Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States", and "Report of Proposed Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States", prepared by the Advisory Committee on Rules of Civil Procedure, be printed in one volume with an index as a House document; and that five thousand additional copies shall be printed, of which three thousand copies shall be for the use of th. House document room and two thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the committee amendments and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 207 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (h) (1), Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments acting as a whole, not to exceed $5,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman of the said committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,500."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? May I have 5 minutes?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House, may I yield 5 minutes to a Member without losing control of the time, and yielding the floor?

The SPEAKER. If debate is desired?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes. I will not lose control of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may do that.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Under those circumstances, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Reorganization bill came into effect, among the committees authorized by the law there was the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That committee was supposed to be the over-all investigating committee. Some of the papers characterized it as the Blue Ribbon Investigating Committee. They said great things would come out of that committee. People had great expectations that that committee would really accomplish something worthwhile. To it the leadership assigned six members of the Rules Committee.

On the 3d day of January, I offered an amendment to the act which would have given every standing committee of the House $10,000, just the same as was granted to the committees of the Senate for general use and expenses. That was voted down, and we were told that our committee on expenditures would be given funds to make whatever investigations were necessary. When other committees asked for money to investigate various matters that I thought fell within the jurisdiction of that committee—and I am sure did rest within the jurisdiction of that committee—we made no objection; we let them go ahead. We were glad to get rid of part of the work, because we knew we would have more than we were able to do. Then there was created a Subcommittee To Investigate Surplus War Property. That committee was given, I think, $50,000. It was a continuation of the old Slaughter committee. The committee has done a remarkably efficient and worth-while job. As I read the report and review the testimony taken, it shows where they have saved, by preventing certain activities, several million dollars. There can be no question but that every cent spent by that committee was justified.

Then we had another subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], a committee on propaganda that it was charged was illegal. That committee was given the modest sum of $26,000. One reading the reports of that committee is convinced, cannot help but be convinced, that so much of that money as was spent was spent judiciously. That committee did a remarkable job. A great saving will come from the activities of that committee, and it is barely possible that some in the Government service may find themselves behind the prison bars. I most respectfully ask the Members of the House to read the reports of that committee.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would like to point out to the gentleman and to the House that of the $26,000 given to the committee of which I am chairman, less than $5,000 thus far has been spent in the two investigations we have made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A most remarkable record; a most remarkable record. And the Members of the House, who know of the investigation and the activities of that committee, are confident that not one cent will be wasted, and that the Government will be saved many, many dollars because of the activities of that committee. Then there was another committee headed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], whose activities have not yet ceased. Every member of that committee has been and is on the job and so are the members of the staff. So, there were three committees. There was another committee which took the place of the old Smith committee investigating extra legal activities. That committee of which I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee was given, I think, $40,000 and, as the record shows, I think it has on hand at this time some $38,000.

That committee did a job on racketeering by so-called unions and union men who had seized and improperly used union organizations. If the Department of Justice does its duty, some racketeers and extortionists will land in Federal penitentiaries.

The committee to investigate the State Department, headed by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] was given $10,000, and only a small portion of that has been expended. That committee has been very cautious in spending the Government's money and to get a dollar's value for a dollar spent.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of that committee.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The subcommittee investigating the State Department has made use of a staff member and the facilities afforded by the committee, and not a penny of that $10,000 has been spent up to this moment. We have been able to do this work without spending any of this money.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman who is chairman of the subcommittee investigating the State Department now advises me that not one cent of the appropriation has been spent, that they have been using the committee staff. The report filed yesterday shows that the committee knows what is needed and has in no way failed to give worthwhile service.

Then we have the committee which investigated the Dock Street strike situa-

tion and that turned up cases showing violations of the law. We have been asking, besieging, begging, the Attorney General's department to prosecute and put behind the bars at least some of those offenders. So far we have gotten nowhere.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are many, many requests for investigations coming in which do not fall within the jurisdiction of any of these subcommittees.

I never was a spender nor a waster, nor, so far as I know, is any member of our committee inclined to waste money.

Within the past 15 days there was a conference of Governors held at Salt Lake City, Utah. One of the subjects of the conference was to determine how to get the most out of funds which were appropriated jointly by the municipalities, the States, and the Federal Government to carry on work in which all were interested.

We were told that the Senate was sending a committee out to attend the conference. As chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I was asked to name a committee to attend the sessions of the convention, at which I am advised all but two of the Governors were present. And so a member of the committee and a secretary were sent to the governors' conference.

They returned with a full, complete, and instructive report, and the total expense to the committee was $39.96, plus $42.

The representatives of the committee hitchhiked rides on Government planes both ways. They charged for, and only for, their actual disbursements.

I cite this to show the Members of the House that our committee is not wasting Government funds; that it is performing its duty efficiently and economically. I cite it also as an illustration of what can be done, and done without great expense, if there is a real desire to serve the Federal Government.

A few weeks ago I asked for $5,000 to be granted to the full committee to carry on its investigations, because we did not have one red penny to carry on those investigations called for by individuals and organizations throughout the country on matters which the chairman of that committee thinks ought to be investigated, but which will not fall within the jurisdiction of any of the subcommittees.

Early in the history of these committees I refused to sign vouchers for money spent under the direction of subcommittee chairmen, because I did not and could not know anything about what they were spending it for. I reached the logical conclusion, at least, I thought it was logical, that if a chairman of a standing committee appointed a chairman of a subcommittee, he ought to have confidence enough in the subcommittee chairman to let him spend his money the way he wanted it spent, and to sign vouchers for the money spent.

The other day when I asked for $5,000 for the full committee, what did they do to me? They gave me $1,500.

So if, during the remaining 5 months of the year, the Members of the House or their constituents write me demanding investigations of something that should be investigated, just please remember that the full committee—the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments—the so-called blue-ribbon investigating committee of the House, the committee of the House which has on it six members of the great Rules Committee, has $1,500—count them, $1,500—to spend in conducting investigations.

The committee and its chairman will do their best, their utmost, to give you good service. But it will not get very far on the amount given it.

Please believe me when I say we will endeavor to be as careful of that precious $1,500 as would the most efficient miser. While we are spending it, if we do spend it, we will refrain from looking with envy at those committees traveling abroad, at the spenders of the billions which are to be sent abroad.

In a lighter vein, permit me now to say to you gentlemen of the House that if there are any of you who have not been on a junketing expedition somewhere, or if you have a staff member who has not been on a junketing expedition somewhere, just let me know—and I am extending the same invitation to the Members of the other body, join us and help us avoid wasting any part of the money given us. File your request with me, so that perhaps you can get in and help me during the next 5 months save part of that $1,500 which was so generously given our committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan that his committee has already had for the five subcommittees $196,000, and was permitted today $25,000 more.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. I might say that when the chairman of this committee says he will not be responsible for the vouchers of his subcommittees, he is the only committee chairman in the House that I know of that will not take that responsibility. The subcommittees of that committee have been granted over $190,000. The Committee on House Administration did not feel that any committee should just be given a blank check to do as they pleased with it. We gave them $1,500 so in case a necessity arose and some member of their staff had to take a trip throughout the country some day, they would have enough to pay his carfare.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think that statement answers the charge of the gentleman from Michigan that this committee has not dealt fairly with the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS ADMINISTRATION OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGEL of Michigan, CASE of South Dakota, TIBBOTT, SCRIVNER, KERR, MAHON, and NORRELL.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 297) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 293, by the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of advisers, consultants, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the study of the tax question by the Ways and Means Committee is authorized by the House. The request for this small amount of funds was made jointly, I believe, by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman and ranking minority member of the great Committee on Ways and Means.

The Committee on House Administration felt that this money would be prudently expended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to extend my thanks to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration for the many courtesies that he has extended to me and also to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM], chairman of the subcommittee, who gave me an opportunity to appear before the committee, as well as to the other members of his committee for their graciousness. I appear before the House today with the thought in mind that a certain situation should be called to the attention of all the Members

before they cast their vote on this resolution. I want it understood at the outset that whatever I say should not be interpreted to reflect upon the character or reputation of any individual, but rather, that I am addressing my remarks to the principle involved and to certain practices to which I very seriously object.

I realize that whatever I say here will not prevent this resolution from being adopted or prevent $25,000 being made available to the Committee on Ways and Means for the purpose of defraying certain expenses. But I do think that the membership of the House should be aware of the fact that this resolution is merely an act of charity to bail out the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for a mistake that he made in ignoring his committee and going out on his own speaking for the committee, yet without the authority of the committee, and appointing a so-called advisory committee made up of representatives of big business, Wall Street lawyers, and bankers, and others.

As I said before, I do not reflect upon their character, because if I were a professional man I, too, would be selling my services as they are doing. But the fact of the matter is that this committee is dominated by men who have appeared before our committee before and have expounded their views. Most of them have testified at the hearings recently held by our committee. So I see no good reason to have this so-called tax advisory committee using $25,000 of the taxpayers' money to defray their expenses. We have their testimony. They have also appeared before the committee in previous years. The truth of the matter is, as I said before, we are simply going to bail out the chairman for having made an error, which he admitted in the committee recently and apologized to the committee at the time he was looking for some money to defray the expenses of this special group.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Does the gentleman mean to say that the committee has evidence that these men have submitted in the past; they have held hearings and you have their views on record now?

Mr. FORAND. The hearings are full of their statements.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. In the old days when we had witnesses come down we paid them $6 a day and transportation. This resolution provides $25,000. Is that correct?

Mr. FORAND. That is correct. And the chairman made a statement to the press that these men would not receive salaries but their expenses would be defrayed.

This group has come to Washington on two occasions, and therefore the expenses for those two trips now stare the committee in the face.

I believe that with the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the staff of experts on the committee, the staff of the Treasury, which is made available to us by the Secretary of the Treasury, we have all the experts we need, so that the committee itself can write a bill, with the help of its own experts, and without having any outsiders come in and tell us how to do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 5 minutes now, and if he needs more time I may yield him more time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of House Resolution 297 is to provide the necessary funds for the activities of an illegitimate and handpicked committee of outsiders appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means without prior consultation with or approval of the Committee on Ways and Means. No other purpose was suggested by the chairman of the committee for offering this resolution. This so-called Special Tax Study Committee was first announced by the chairman in a press release on June 8, 1947.

This Tax Study Committee of lawyers and businessmen, with one representative from organized labor, held its first meeting in Washington in the Ways and Means Committee room in the Capitol on June 12, 1947. At that time Mr. KNUTSON announced that "meetings of the special study group will be called by the chairman at such times and places as he may determine. The members of the special study group will serve without compensation, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in attending meetings of the study group called by the chairman. The expenses so incurred will be paid out of funds appropriated for the purposes mentioned on vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means."

If I understand the foregoing statements of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, they authorize the chairman of the Special Tax Study Committee to call meetings wherever and whenever he may desire, with a blank check for all expenses incurred by the members in attending such meetings, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means promised to approve the vouchers for such expenses.

While this Tax Advisory Committee was meeting on June 12 the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] and I took the House floor to call attention to the fact that the Special Tax Study Committee had never even been discussed in a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means. Indeed it was not until July 15, more than a month later, that the chairman first mentioned his Special Tax Study Committee in a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means. At that time he announced the introduction of House Resolution 293 and House Resolution 297 and requested authorization from the Committee on Ways and Means to proceed to obtain their enactment.

There are several reasons for my opposition to giving any official status to this outside advisory group:

First. The committee already has the able assistance of the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Mr. Colin F. Stam, and his expert staff; the Office of Tax Legislative Counsel and Division of Tax Research of the Treasury Department; the technical and administrative people of the Bureau of Internal Revenue; and the staff of technical advisers recently added to assist the committee in accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act of last year. No necessity has been shown for any outside tax-study group.

Second. The committee has been holding hearings for nearly 2 months on the subject of a comprehensive revision of the Internal Revenue Code. So every taxpayers' group represented among the membership of this committee has had an opportunity to come in and present their views on tax matters to the committee in open hearings.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. How much additional time does the gentleman want?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Three minutes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Iowa can yield him my time, too.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That will not be necessary.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Third. A comprehensive revision of the Internal Revenue Code is not a part-time job to be entrusted to professional and business men already heavily loaded with personal responsibilities. It is a matter for continuous and painstaking study and draftsmanship by our tried and trusted tax specialists, including Mr. Beaman of the House legislative counsel.

Fourth. If an advisory committee is to be appointed, it should not be stacked with Members whose views on tax matters are so openly one-sided. Mr. Roswell Magill, the chairman of the special tax-study committee; Mr. John W. Hanes, and Mr. J. Cheever Cowdin, all are known to be spokesmen for big business and special interests in tax matters.

The appointment of the Magill committee was headlined in the New York Journal of Commerce on June 10, 1947, as follows:

Magill appointment underscores trend toward sales taxes.

The Wall Street Journal commented:

The emphasis in Congress is shifting from tax relief to tax-law revision, meaning redistribution of the tax burden.

And further:

Republican ideas are mirrored in the naming of Roswell Magill to head a Ways and Means Committee tax-study group. Mr. Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, has been chairman of the privately financed committee on postwar tax study. He supported GOP plans for a 20-percent tax cut across the board. His tax-study group recommends higher excises, and suggests the possibility of a 5-percent retail sales tax, along with other major revisions in the tax law that would immediately benefit stockholders, families with taxable incomes above the first surtax bracket, and businesses that encounter temporary financial hardships.

In conclusion, the Constitution vests the House of Representatives with exclusive power to originate revenue legislation. The House has delegated jurisdiction over tax measures to the Committee on Ways and Means. The people are entitled to the assurance that only their duly elected representatives, or properly selected professional employees of the Government, shall participate in the drafting of tax legislation. The taxing power so carefully restricted in the Constitution should not surreptitiously be delegated to, or subverted by, small groups representing their own selfish interests.

To bring men down from Wall Street to write the 1948 tax bill is in itself inexcusable. To pay the expenses of these men, some of whom come down in their own private airplane, is extravagant and wasteful, and an activity which an economy-minded House of Representatives ought not to sanction.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the 5 minutes allotted me because I realize that the efforts of the opposition have proven a fizzle. I do want to say to the House, however, that the action of the chairman was ratified by a vote of 18 to 4 in the Ways and Means Committee and among those who voted to sustain the chairman was the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], former chairman, and a great chairman, of the Ways and Means Committee.

In appearing against the resolution before the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island started out with the usual balderdash about the Wall Street bankers. When he saw he was not getting anywhere with that attack he tried several other lines. I do not think I am divulging any confidences when I say that every member of the subcommittee voted to report this resolution out.

I have no desire to help the opponents of this resolution attain further political publicity.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I would like to stress this fact: The gentleman and I have been on the Ways and Means Committee for 15 years and this is the first time our committee has asked for a dime out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; that is true. It is also the first time that some of the gentlemen have made the column of a certain columnist, a vehicle for personal aggrandizement. The information that the columnist was furnished by a member of our committee is greatly exaggerated and much of it is unfounded, but it made a pretty good story at that. I have never gone in for peanut stuff; I am too old in my services in the House to indulge in peanut politics now, and so far as I am concerned, the resolution may be acted upon at this time.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it is important for the Members of this House to know that almost every single Member that has already been appointed to this Tax Study Committee was handpicked by the chairman without even his own Members knowing anything about it, except that he had consulted with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] who gave him the name of one man out of 11 who was put on this committee. So, you know the type of committee that you are voting to legitimatize today.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Minnesota are in agreement on this.

Like other committees of this House, we have our fair share of publicity seekers and demagogs.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret to find myself in disagreement with my two colleagues the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], both of whom I know are able, diligent, and useful members of that committee. The purpose of the committee authorized by this resolution is not to reduce or to raise or to increase or lower taxes. It is a study for revision and a simplification of our present tax laws. That is the work the committee has in hand now, and it has been working on it for some time, and it is work that this special advisory committee was to advise the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to.

Now, this advisory group will not sit in with the Committee on Ways and Means. The Committee on Ways and Means writes tax legislation in executive session, based on such information and facts as it is able to gather, with the help of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Treasury staff. Witnesses appear before it.

I do not believe politics should be mixed up with tax matters. I never did believe that, and while I was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means I will say that the minority members of that committee, with very slight exception, if any, went along with the majority members. We proposed many tax measures during the war. We wrote, perhaps, more tax laws, and proposed heavier taxes, than ever in the history of the country, and we worked along without any division of political lines.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I am sure the gentleman will agree that he consulted with every member of the committee. The committee was advised what he planned to do, and that he did nothing without consulting the committee, and for that reason he had the support and he still has the support and the respect of the Members, because he deserves it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. While I am not familiar with all the personnel of this committee, from what I know of them by reputation, they are outstanding in their qualifications to advise the committee with respect to the revision of our tax laws. Dr. Magill was Under Secretary of the Treasury, selected by President Roosevelt, and I suppose approved by Secretary Morgenthau, for a year and 7½ months. He was adviser to our committee. I never heard a suggestion that he was partisan or that he was a Wall Street banker or anything of that kind. We all had confidence in him. He was able, and he was very helpful to us in his work. John Hanes, another member of this advisory committee, who during the Roosevelt administration was appointed I suppose with the approval of Secretary Morgenthau, as Assistant Secretary, and served in that capacity about 4 months, and then when Dr. Magill resigned he was promoted to Under Secretary and served as Under Secretary for a year and 2 months. I have never heard any criticism as far as his being partisan. He was able, he was outstanding. Another member of that committee was the present Governor of Kansas, Frank Carlson, who served as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means for a number of years. He is able, he is nonpartisan as far as a man can be; fair minded in every respect. So far as I know the members of this committee are able and outstanding businessmen. The question of revision of our present tax laws is a job that we have been unable to do for a long time. Due to the press of work of our committee during the war we never had time to get to it. Now the Committee on Ways and Means is going to undertake this study under the direction of its able chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota. He says, and I have no reason to believe otherwise, that the work will be carried on in a nonpartisan way. The minority members will be consulted as well as the majority members. I am hopeful they will make a thorough study to assist the committee in simplifying our present tax laws so the ordinary taxpayer will not have to go to an expert accountant or lawyer and pay a big fee to get his tax returns made out. I think that with the help of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the staff of the Treasury, and this advisory committee that has been appointed, we can do a good job in revising our present tax laws.

I am sorry that I find myself compelled to disagree with my colleagues. The chairman perhaps was a little premature when he first named the committee, but after his work was approved by the committee, as he has stated, by a vote of 18 to 4, I feel that the resolution should be adopted for the good of our committee and the work that we may be able to do for the Congress.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST].

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated that as far as he knew the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means had not consulted with anyone with the possible exception of our minority leader, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. For the information of the House, may I say

that the chairman came to me when he was considering appointing Wright Mathews, of Texas, and asked me if I knew him. I told him yes, I had the pleasure of knowing him, and I thought he was one of the most capable and one of the most outstanding tax lawyers in the United States. He was Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, appointed by President Roosevelt's administration, and rendered very efficient service in that position. It is true he is not a Wall Street banker, but I can assure the House that there is not a finer or more capable and honest man in the country than Wright Mathews. He will be an honor to the committee.

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

Mr. WEST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am delighted the gentleman has given the House this information. This is the first intimation I have had that any other person was consulted with the exception of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. I know the majority members of the committee were not consulted before these selections were made, so the gentleman was getting special attention at the time the chairman of the committee consulted him.

Mr. WEST. You are getting an especially good man on the committee in Wright Mathews.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I agree with the gentleman. I assume Mr. Mathews is a fine expert.

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

Mr. WEST. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I say that of the committee of 11 that was appointed 6 are Democrats, 1 from Virginia, and my distinguished colleague can testify to his character and ability.

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

Mr. WEST. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Lane, of Virginia, was appointed to this committee, as I understand. I have known Mr. Lane practically all of his life. He does not come from my district, but he is a Virginian. Mr. Lane came up the hard way. He worked himself up in the plant of which he now is the head. I think he is well qualified to pass on tax matters. He is a man who may be very helpful in the committee that has been appointed.

I also happen to know two other gentlemen of this committee, one being the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Hanes. It has also been my privilege to know the former member of the committee who is now Governor of the State of Kansas, Mr. Frank Carlson. I compliment the gentleman on the type of men he has selected for this committee.

Mr. WEST. I join in that commendation.

May I say in conclusion that I think there is no finer character to be found anywhere than Wright Mathews.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 336), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective July 1, 1947, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation per annum, payable monthly, to certain employees of the House, so long as the positions are held by the present incumbents, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

To the disbursing clerk the sum of $1,000 basic.

OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

To the superintendent of the document room the sum of $1,000 basic.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I inquire as to the status of House Concurrent Resolution 31 which was favorably reported by the gentleman's committee on April 24?

Mr. LECOMPTE. We have a number of resolutions that we have not been able to get to yet. The gentleman's resolution is among them, and if we can get to it, it will be called up.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I just wanted to be assured that the gentleman is going to call up the resolution sometime. I have spoken to the majority leader, and he seems to be agreeable.

Mr. LECOMPTE. There are a good many resolutions that we have not been able to get to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—CONTESTED ELECTIONS

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 337) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding any adjournment or recess of the Eightieth Congress, testimony and papers received by the Clerk of the House in any contested-election case shall be transmitted by the Clerk to the Speaker for reference to the Committee on House Administration in the same manner as though such adjournment or recess had not occurred: *Provided*, That any such testimony and papers referred by the Speaker shall be printed as House documents of the next succeeding session of the Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 338) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding any adjournments or recesses of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, the Committee on House Administration is authorized to continue its investigations in the contested-election cases of Mankin against Davis, Lowe against Davis, and Wilson against Granger. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution resolution (H. Res. 339) to implement the resolution just passed and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 338, by the Committee on House Administration, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $5,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARINE CORPS MEMORIAL, GRANT PARK, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 112 to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial.

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

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

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the Marine Corps Memorial Commission, and to be composed of three Commissioners to be appointed by the President of the United States. The Commission shall consider and formulate plans for the erection upon a suitable site in Grant Park, in the city of Chicago, Ill., of an appropriate memorial to the members of the United States Marine Corps who have given their lives in the service of their country.

SEC. 2. The Commission may accept from any source, public or private, money or other property for use in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution; and is authorized to cooperate with interested public and private organizations in carrying out such functions.

SEC. 3. Upon the request of the Commission, the heads of the Federal departments or agencies may designate such personnel of their respective departments or agencies, or of the Marine Corps, as the case may be, as may be necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation except that their actual expenses in connection with the work of the Commission may be paid from any funds available for the purposes of this joint resolution, or acquired by other means herein authorized.

SEC. 5. The members of the Commission shall select one of their number as chairman and another as secretary.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall report its recommendations to Congress at the earliest practicable date.

The resolution 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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a manscript entitled "New Zealand Social Security Plan," notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the two-page limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $337.25.

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

There was no objection.

CONTESTED ELECTION—FREDERICK M. ROBERTS AGAINST HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration, and ordered printed:

JULY 25, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: On December 4, 1946, Frederick M. Roberts served notice on HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, returned Member from the Fourteenth Congressional District of the State of California, of his purpose to contest the election of the said DOUGLAS and filed a copy of said notice in this office. Now comes the sitting Member, HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, and in a communication filed with me July 24, 1947, moves to dismiss the contest, setting forth the reasons therefor.

For the information of the House, the Clerk deems it proper to state that no testimony on behalf of either party has been filed in his office as required and in the manner prescribed by law, and it would therefore appear that the contest had abated.

The notice of contest of Mr. Roberts and the motion to dismiss of the returned Member, together with a copy of the letter of her attorney, are submitted herewith for the consideration of the appropriate committee.

Respectfully,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 340.

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

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

Resolved, That House Resolution 36, Eightieth Congress, authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to continue certain investigations, is hereby amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: The committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

The resolution 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 PUBLIC LAW 27, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 245, amending Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress.

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

Resolved, etc., That section 2 of Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress, approved March 31, 1947, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The authority granted by this resolution shall remain in force only until April 1, 1948: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, to grant waivers for the employment of alien seamen except for those who served between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, aboard vessels operated by the War Shipping Administration, the United States Maritime Commission, or the Army Transport Service."

The resolution 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.

WILLIAM L. CUNLIFFE

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 4177, for the relief of William L. Cunliffe.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, William L. Cunliffe, of Montreal, Canada, who is of English descent, father of Bruce Ferguson Cunliffe, a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to have been born in Canada rather than in India, where his parents were residing at the time the said William L. Cunliffe was born.

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 IMMIGRATION ACT, 1917

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 1463, an act to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States," approved February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 882; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 148), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. That upon the arrival of any alien, United States citizen, or national, by water at any port within the United States on the North American Continent from a foreign port or port of Guam, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, or other insular possession of the United States, or at any port of the said insular possessions from any foreign port, from a port in the United States on the North American Continent, or from a port of another insular possession of the United States, it shall be the duty of the master or commanding officer, owners, or consignees of the steamer, sailing, or other vessel, having said alien, United States citizen, or national on board to deliver to the immigration officers at the port of arrival typewritten or printed lists or manifests made at the time and place of embarkation of such alien, United States citizen, or national on board such steamer or vessel, and such lists or manifests shall be in such form and contain such information as the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, shall by regulation prescribe as necessary for the identification of the persons transported and for the enforcement of the immigration laws. That it shall further be the duty of the master or commanding officer of every vessel taking passengers from any port of the United States on the North American Continent to a foreign port or a port of Guam, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, or other insular possession of the United States, or from any port of the said insular possessions to any foreign port, to a port of the United States on the North American Continent, or to a port of another insular possession of the United States to file with the immigration officials before departure a list of all aliens, United States citizens, or nationals, taken on board, said list to be in such form and to contain such information as the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, shall by regulation prescribe as necessary for the identification of the persons transported and for the enforcement of the immigration laws. No master or commanding officer of any such vessel shall be granted clearance papers for his vessel until he has deposited such list or lists with the immigration officials at the port of departure and made oath that they are full and complete as to the information required to be contained therein. Any neglect or omission to comply with the requirements of this section shall be punishable as provided in section 14 of this act: *Provided*, That in the case of vessels making regular trips to ports of the United States the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, may, when expedient, arrange for the delivery of lists of outgoing aliens, United States citizens, or nationals at a later date: *Provided further*, That it shall be the duty of immigration officials to record the following information regarding every resident alien and citizen or national leaving the United States by way of the Canadian or Mexican borders for permanent residence in a foreign country: Name, age, and sex; whether married or single; calling or occupation, whether able to read or write; nationality; country of birth; country of which citizen or subject; race; last permanent residence in the United States; intended future permanent residence; and time and port of last arrival in the

United States; and if a United States citizen, or national, the facts on which claim to that status is based."

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.

AMENDING NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940 AS AMENDED

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4160) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (n) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is amended, effective October 8, 1940, to read as follows:

"SEC. 602. (n) Upon application by the insured and under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate, payment of premiums on such insurance may be waived during the continuous total disability of the insured, which continues or has continued for 6 or more consecutive months, if such disability commenced (1) subsequent to the date of his application for insurance, (2) while the insurance was in force under premium-paying conditions, and (3) prior to the insured's sixtieth birthday: *Provided*, That upon application made within 1 year after the date of this enactment the Administrator shall grant waiver of any premium becoming due on or after October 8, 1940, and prior to the date of this enactment which may be waived under the foregoing provisions of this subsection: *Provided further*, That the Administrator, upon any application made subsequent to 1 year after the date of this enactment, shall not grant waiver of any premium becoming due more than 1 year prior to the receipt in the Veterans' Administration of application for the same, except as hereinafter provided. Any premiums paid for months during which waiver is effective shall be applied to payment of premiums subsequently becoming due on such insurance unless the insured requests a refund thereof. The Administrator shall provide by regulations for examination or reexamination of an insured claiming benefits under this subsection, and may deny benefits for failure to cooperate. In the event that it is found that an insured is no longer totally disabled, the waiver of premiums shall cease as of the date of such finding and the policy of insurance may be continued by payment of premiums as provided in said policy: *Provided further*, That in any case in which the Administrator finds that the insured's failure to make timely application for waiver of premiums or his failure to submit satisfactory evidence of the existence or continuance of total disability was due to circumstances beyond his control, the Administrator may grant waiver or continuance of waiver or premiums: *Provided further*, That in the event of death of the insured without filing application for waiver, the beneficiary, within 1 year after the death of the insured or of this enactment, whichever be the later, or, if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, within 1 year after removal of such legal disability, may file application for waiver with evidence of the insured's right to waiver under this section. Such application filed by the beneficiary shall have the same effect as if filed by the insured. In any case in which premiums are not waived under this subsection solely because the insured died prior to the continuance of total disability for 6 months, and proof of such facts, satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, is filed by the beneficiary with the Veterans' Administration within 1 year after this enactment, or 1 year after the insured's death, whichever is the later date, his insurance shall be deemed to be in force at the date of his death: *And provided further*, That if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, proof of such facts may be filed within 1 year after removal of such legal disability. Premium rates shall be calculated without charge for the cost of the waiver of premiums herein provided and no deduction from benefits otherwise payable shall be made on account thereof."

SEC. 2. Subsection (r) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, line 6, strike out "or" and insert "of."

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.

SALE OF PAXON FIELD, DUVAL COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1582) relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 or of any other law, the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell all that tract or parcel of land described as part of the northwest quarter and the north half southwest quarter section 8, township 2 south, range 26 east, Duval County, Fla., described as follows:

Beginning at an iron stake six hundred and seventy-two feet east of the northwest corner of section 8 and on the north line of said section; thence east one thousand three hundred and twenty-four and seven-tenths feet to an iron; thence south no degrees fifty minutes east three hundred and thirty feet to an iron; thence east six hundred and thirty feet to an iron, set in concrete on the west side of Melson Avenue; thence south no degrees fifty minutes east along west side of said avenue one thousand nine hundred and eighty-five and two-tenths feet to an iron; thence west six hundred and thirty feet to an iron; thence south no degrees fifty minutes east three hundred feet to an iron on the north line of Louisa Street; thence west one thousand three hundred and sixty-one and one-tenth feet to an iron; thence north two thousand six hundred and sixteen and two-tenths feet to place of beginning, containing one hundred and nine and thirty-eight one-hundredths acres, more or less; also

Beginning at an iron, six hundred and seventy-two feet east and two thousand six hundred and seventy-six and two-tenths feet south of the northwest corner of section 8; thence east one thousand nine hundred and ninety-two and two-tenths feet to a concrete monument on the west side of Melson Avenue; thence south zero degrees fifty minutes east along the west side of said avenue one thousand three hundred feet to an iron; thence west one thousand four hundred and eleven and three-tenths feet to an iron; thence north fifty feet to an iron; thence west six hundred feet to an iron; thence north one thousand two hundred and fifty feet to place of beginning, containing fifty-nine and eight-tenths acres, more or less, and being the same land as shown as tracts 1 and 2 on plat recorded in plat book 13, page 82, public records of said county, and containing one hundred and sixty-nine and eighteen one-hundredths acres, more or less; also

Part of south half southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter, section 8, township 2 south, range 26 east, Duval County, Fla., bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a stone monument at the northwest corner of section 8, township 2 south, range 26 east; thence along west line of said section 8, south one degree sixteen minutes east two thousand six hundred and forty-six and four-tenths feet to a point; thence east one thousand nine hundred and seventy-four and three-tenths feet to a point; thence north zero degrees fifty minutes west thirty feet to an iron stake in the north line of Louisa Street for a place of beginning of lands to be described; from said place of beginning run east along the north line of Louisa Street six hundred and thirty feet to an iron stake in the west line of Melson Avenue; thence along the west line of Melson Avenue north zero degrees fifty minutes west three hundred feet to an iron stake; thence west six hundred and thirty feet to an iron stake; thence south zero degrees fifty minutes east three hundred feet to place of beginning.

Recorded in deed book 700, at page 497, of the current public records of Duval County, Fla., containing 180 acres of land, more or less, together with all buildings, structures, and improvements thereon (known as Paxon Field), in the manner and subject to the terms and conditions provided in the act entitled "An act to authorize the sale of Federal buildings," approved August 26, 1935 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 40, sec. 345b).

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

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 3988) were laid on the table.

OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3045) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the processes and procedures for recording instruments of writing in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ALLEN of California, MCMAHON, and ABERNETHY.

REHABILITATION OF ALCOHOLICS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2659) to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with

Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ALLEN of California, MILLER of Nebraska, and DEANE.

RELIEF OF ACCOUNTABLE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1350) to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Accounting Office is authorized, after consideration of the pertinent findings and if in concurrence with the determinations and recommendations of the head of the department or independent establishment concerned, to relieve any disbursing or other accountable officer or agent or former disbursing or other accountable officer or agent of any such department or independent establishment of the Government charged with responsibility on account of physical loss or deficiency for any reason whatsoever of Government funds, vouchers, records, checks, securities, or papers in his charge, if the head of the department or independent establishment determines (1) that such loss or deficiency occurred while such officer or agent was acting in the discharge of his official duties, or that such loss or deficiency occurred by reason of the act or omission of a subordinate of such officer or agent; and (2) that such loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on the part of such officer or agent. This act shall be applicable only to the actual physical loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, checks, securities, or papers, and shall not include deficiencies in the accounts of such officers or agents resulting from illegal or erroneous payments.

SEC. 2. The paragraph of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, relating to relief of disbursing officers of the Navy (41 Stat. 132; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 105), and the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge," approved December 13, 1944 (58 Stat. 800; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 95a), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "for any reason whatsoever."

And on page 2, strike out section 2 and insert:

"SEC. 2. This act shall not operate to repeal the provisions of the paragraph of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, relating to relief of disbursing officers of the Navy (41 Stat. 132; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 105), and the act entitled 'An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge,' approved December 13, 1944 (58 Stat. 800; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 95a)."

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

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman give us a brief explanation of the bill as amended?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I shall be glad to do so.

When this bill was considered by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, a subcommittee of three members was appointed to make a study and report. This committee consisted of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS], and myself.

This is a Senate bill. I understand it was introduced at the request of the Treasury Department.

This bill originally authorized relief for the Chief Disbursing Officer of the Treasury Department and others in the Department who were short in their accounts through no fault or negligence of their own. In the Senate it was amended to cover any disbursing officer in any department of the Government, including the Army and the Navy. When our committee took up this bill the Army and Navy objected to being included in this legislation, as both departments now have laws under which their disbursing officers are relieved from financial liability for losses which occur without negligence on their part. The General Accounting Office prefers to have all branches of the Government, including the Army and Navy, covered by one law. The committee decided, that because of the lack of time, no general bill could be agreed upon and considered at this session of Congress. We therefore recommended an amendment eliminating the Army and Navy from the provisions of this measure. The bill specifically provides that the laws relating to the relief of disbursing officers of the Army and Navy shall not be repealed.

At the present time, disbursing officers in other than the Army and Navy departments, can only be relieved of responsibility by the passage of a private bill by Congress, or by the filing of a suit by the officer or agent in the Court of Claims. This bill provides for the granting of administrative relief in these cases, and applies only where the loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on the part of the officer involved. The bill does not cover shortages or deficiencies resulting from illegal or erroneous payments.

This bill will take care of the situation until further time can be had to study this entire question. The Treasury Department is very anxious to have this bill passed at this session. The General Accounting Office has agreed to the bill in its present form. All departments are included except the Army and Navy. I may say to the gentleman from Tennessee it is contemplated that a thorough study will be made of the entire situation in the next few months by the General Accounting Office, in conjunction with the proper Army and Navy officers in the hope a bill can be introduced early in the next session which will be general in character, and which will include all departments, including the Army and Navy. This bill is necessary at this time in order to provide the relief sought by the Treasury Department, as well as other Government agencies, for their disbursing officers and agents who are short in their accounts through no fault or negligence of their own.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNAUTHORIZED USE OF THE OFFICIAL SEAL, EMBLEM, AND NAME OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4186) to prohibit and punish the unauthorized use of the official seal, emblem, and name of the United Nations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill and the necessity for it?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we are the host nation to the United Nations it is important that we protect the use of their seal and name against unauthorized commercial exploitation. By resolution of the United Nations General Assembly the member nations were requested to afford this protection, and as the nation in which the United Nations headquarters is located this is especially applicable to us. The bill protects valid trade-marks or copyrights which have been obtained using the name "United Nations," but does not permit renewals. Other users of the name or insignia before the United Nations Charter came into effect have a year in which to bring themselves into conformity with this bill when enacted into law. Trade-marks using the name have been registered for such things as women's apparel, textiles, and paper stationery. All other commercial exploitation of the emblem, name, or seal of the United Nations, aside from what I have specified, without permission of the Secretary-General of the United Nations is prohibited by this bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are as contained in the bill?

Mr. JAVITS. The penalty is as for a misdemeanor against any individual corporation, partnership, and so forth who use the United Nations name, emblem, or seal commercially without permission of the United Nations itself or as permitted by this 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 this act may be cited as the "United Nations Official Seal, Emblem, and Name Act, 1947."

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public entity, public or private institution, group, or other entity, other than the United Nations.

(b) The term "United Nations" means the international organization established under that name by the Charter of the United Nations; and

(c) The "emblem or the official seal of the United Nations" may be described as follows: "A map of the world representing an azimuthal equidistant projection centered on the North Pole, inscribed in a wreath consisting of crossed conventionalized branches of the olive tree; in gold on a field of smoke-blue with all water areas in white. The projection of the map extends to 60 degrees south latitude, and includes five concentric circles."

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful, without the authorization of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, for any person to use, whether as a trade-mark, commercial label, or portion thereof, or as an advertisement or insignia for any business or organization or for any trade, commercial, or charitable purpose, within the jurisdiction of the United States of America, the name or the abbreviation thereof through the use of its initial letters, the emblem, or the official seal of the United Nations, or any simulation thereof: *Provided*, That any person who, or whose assignor, actually used the name or the abbreviation thereof through the use of its initial letters, the emblem, or the official seal of the United Nations, or any simulation thereof may continue such use for the same purpose for a period not to exceed 1 year from the date of enactment of this act or for the period remaining, on the date of the enactment of this act, under a valid and subsisting trade-mark or copyright, which, however, shall not be subject to renewal: *Provided further*, That no such use shall be made with the fraudulent purpose of inducing the belief that it is sponsored by or in any way officially connected with the United Nations.

SEC. 4. Any person who willfully violates or attempts to violate any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be liable to a fine not exceeding $500 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year, or both, for each and every offense.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "political entity."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "group", insert "the United States, including any State of the United States, any political subdivision of such government, and any legal successor, representative, agency, or agency of the foregoing."

Page 3, line 2, after the word "thereof", insert "before October 24, 1945."

Page 3, line 12, strike out "person" and insert "individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, groups, and any legal successor, representative, agent or agency of the foregoing."

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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2173) to amend section 7 of the act entiled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ALLEN of California, MILLER of Nebraska, and DEANE.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4326) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the bill is.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely extends until March 1, 1948, the right of a farmer debtor to file a petition in bankruptcy under the Frazier-Lemke Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy in Railroad Reorganization has also favorably reported a bill to study and to revise the Frazier-Lemke Act. This merely extends the operation of the act until March when we will have an opportunity of revising and rewriting basic legislation; is that correct?

Mr. REED of Illinois. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 75 (c) (U. S. C., title 11, sec. 203) of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, be and is amended to read as follows:

"(c) At any time prior to March 1, 1948, a petition may be filed by any farmer in the district court of the district in which he resides, stating that such farmer is insolvent or unable to meet his debts as they mature and that it is desirable to effect a composition or an extension of time to pay his debts. The petition or answer of the farmer shall be accompanied by his schedules. If any such petition is filed, an order of adjudication shall not be entered except as provided hereinafter in this section."

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. HENDRICKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

GETTYSBURG NATIONAL PARK, PA.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3645) relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the bill does?

Mr. GROSS. There has been some disagreement there. The local cemetery, privately owned, adjoins the national cemetery, and it is simply straightening the line. The Department of the Interior recommends that this be done; the Bureau of the Budget also advises it. The Park Service will get 4 acres of land for which they will give an acre and a quarter to the local cemetery. It is like straightening a fence line between the two cemeteries.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings of land within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to accept, on behalf of the United States, approximately 4 acres of non-Federal land within the park boundaries, such land to be conveyed to the United States without cost by the Evergreen Cemetery Association, of Gettysburg. Upon acceptance of title thereto by the United States, such property shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the park. In exchange for the conveyance to the United States of the aforesaid property, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the Evergreen Cemetery Association approximately 1¼ acres of federally owned land within the park, such property constituting a right-of-way through the Evergreen Cemetery property: *Provided*, That the aforesaid exchange shall be consummated only upon condition that the Secretary is satisfied that such exchange is in the public interest and that the properties to be exchanged are of approximately equal value.

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.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 174, an act to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for

Alaska, and for other purposes," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 15, strike out all after "section." down to and including line 20 and insert "Any rights or privileges acquired hereunder with respect to mining operations in land, title to which is transferred to a future State upon its admission to the Union and which is situated within its boundaries, shall be terminable by such State, and the said mining operations shall be subject to the laws of such State."

Page 3, after line 20, insert:

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to affect or impair any valid claims, rights, or privileges, including possessory claims under the first proviso of section 8 of the act of May 17, 1884 (23 Stat. 26), arising under any other provision of law."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA HEDWIG FERESZ

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1650) for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. CLASON. This bill came out of the Committee on the Judiciary, and after investigation by the Department of Justice it was disclosed that this woman had been in this country since 1939. They said the record showed that she was worthy of remaining in this country. She asks for permission to remain.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I recall, it was with unanimous consent from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLASON. I understood that it was.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Maria Hedwig Feresz, of Hadley, Mass., a Polish national who entered the United States in 1939 for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of January 1, 1939.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the period, insert: "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Polish quota for the first year that the same Polish quota is available."

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.

AMENDING SECTION 14 OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF JUNE 27, 1944

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1494) to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 37).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical with House bill 966 that passed the House on June 19. It is an amendment to the Veterans' Preference Act. The Senate has passed its own bill. In order for this measure to become law it is necessary that either one or the other be adopted. That is the reason I am calling it to the attention of the House today.

Mr. RICH. Has your full committee considered it?

Mr. REES. It has the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first proviso of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387) is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That such preference eligible shall have the right to make a personal appearance, or an appearance through a designated representative, in accordance with such reasonable rules and regulations as may be issued by the Civil Service Commission; after investigation and consideration of the evidence submitted, the Civil Service Commission shall submit its findings and recommendations to the proper administrative officer and shall send copies of the same to the appellant or to his designated representative, and it shall be mandatory for such administrative officer to take such corrective action as the Commission finally recommends."

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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three newspaper articles.

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

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle.

CHEROKEE INDIAN RESERVATION, N. C.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 794) to authorize the sale of a small tract of land on the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. D'EWART. This bill, which has been cleared by the majority leader and the minority leader, proposes to lease 2 acres on the Cherokee Indian Reservation to the Methodist Church for the purpose of building a church on that reservation.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That with the consent of the authorized tribal authorities of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue a license to the Methodist Church to use from two to four acres of tribal land on the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C., for so long a time as such land may be used for church purposes, including the construction of a church building and a parsonage. The license shall be issued by the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative upon such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreeable to the parties, and may be revoked only if and when the land ceases to be used for the purposes for which said license is issued.

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.

WEED KILLER

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 276.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas use of the preparation known as "2,4-D" has been widely recommended as an economical method of killing weeds; and

Whereas, on the basis of such recommendations, rice farmers have applied 2,4-D to their fields; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated that the 2,4-D dust has caused extensive damage to cotton crops located at considerable distances from the fields which were so dusted; and

Whereas there are reports that such dust has also damaged potatoes, soybeans, and other crops; and

Whereas the damage and possible complete destruction of such cotton and other crops will constitute a severe loss to the Nation

and an incalculable blow to the individual farmers concerned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby requested—

(1) to use the facilities of the Department of Agriculture and the radio, press, and various farm groups and organizations to make known to the Nation at once the fact that 2,4-D can be used only with extreme caution:

(2) to make an immediate investigation to determine (a) what crops are harmed by 2,4-D and (b) how far 2,4-D dust will carry and have harmful effects when distributed by airplane and when distributed by ground equipment;

(3) to make a study to determine whether existing supplies of 2,4-D can be mixed with other chemicals in a preparation which will not be harmful to cotton and to other economically valuable plants; and

(4) to make known to the Nation the results of the investigation conducted pursuant to paragraph (2) and of the study conducted pursuant to paragraph (3).

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. HOPE. This resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture. It requests the Secretary of Agriculture to take immediate steps to prevent further damage to crops as a result of the use of the weed killer known as 2,4-D, which is a very potent weed killer, one of the new chemicals. It is being used quite extensively in the rice fields in the South.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is this the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE]?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. It was introduced by him as the result of the immense damage in the cotton fields of Louisiana and Texas which is reported to be occasioned by the use of this chemical.

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4068) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this includes the amendment adopted by the committee?

Mr. DONDERO. It does.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is going to be the cost of the construction of this building?

Mr. DONDERO. The cost of the building will be $22,850,000, but no appropriation is asked for prior to 1950.

Mr. RICH. The idea is to permit the Federal Works Administrator to proceed with the preparation of plans and specifications so that they may be ready in 1950?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. I may say to the gentleman that $7,000,000 has already been appropriated, and the excavation has been made for the basement. That is to prepare the plans so as to be ready for the construction of the building in 1950.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This is an authorization?

Mr. DONDERO. That is right.

Mr. RICH. The construction of this building will release a lot of buildings that are now being occupied in the District by this agency? All the divisions of the General Accounting Office will then be housed in the two buildings?

Mr. DONDERO. In one building. The General Accounting Office is now housed in 21 buildings in the District.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in lieu of completing the construction of the building authorized by the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941 (54 Stat. 1036), for the use and occupancy of the General Accounting Office, the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to construct upon square 518 in the District of Columbia a building for the use and occupancy of the General Accounting Office under a limit cost of $22,850,000, exclusive of funds heretofore obligated or expended for the account of the building hereby superseded: *Provided*, That to the extent practicable, the excavations and construction work heretofore performed upon said site for the building hereby superseded may be utilized for the building herein authorized: *Provided further*, That all powers granted the Federal Works Administrator with respect to the building for the General Accounting Office in the District of Columbia by said First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941, are hereby continued and may be exercised for the purpose of this act within the limits herein fixed.

SEC. 2. The balances of any funds heretofore appropriated under authority of said First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941, for the building superseded by the building herein authorized which are unexpended and unobligated on the date of approval of this act, are hereby made available for the purpose of, and shall be chargeable against the authorization contained in this act; and the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the construction of the building herein authorized within the full limit of cost as established pursuant to section 1 hereof, notwithstanding the fact that appropriations for the full amount of such cost may not have been made.

SEC. 3. No appropriation of funds, in addition to those continued available by section 2 of this act, shall be made for expenditure during any fiscal year prior to 1950: *Provided*, That for expenditure during the fiscal year 1950 and thereafter, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act within the limit of cost of $22,850,000 herein fixed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 22, after "authorized", strike out "within the full limit of cost as established pursuant to section 1 hereof, notwithstanding the fact that appropriations for the full amount of such cost may not have been made" and insert "as funds are appropriated or contract authorization are provided therefor."

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.

ERADICATION OF WATER POLLUTION IN NEW ENGLAND STATES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1418) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman give us some explanation of the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. This bill authorizes the New England States to enter into a compact for the purpose of solving their own steam-pollution problems. I think the Congress of the United States should encourage this kind of legislation.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this bill gives congressional consent to an interstate compact relating to the control and eradication of the pollution of the streams and waters of the New England States which was entered into under authority of Public Resolution 104, Seventy-fourth Congress. It was introduced by Senator Baldwin and other New England Senators, and many of the New England Members of the House also have introduced a similar bill.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This bill has a favorable report from the department and it was unanimously reported out of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the status of the general bill, the Barkley or Mundt stream-pollution bill?

Mr. DONDERO. Hearings have been held, I will say to the gentleman, on such legislation, but the committee has not reported a bill. I believe that will be done when Congress convenes for the next session.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent and approval of Congress is hereby given to an interstate compact relating to the control and reduction of pollution of the streams and waters of the New England States negotiated and entered into or to be entered into under authority of Public Resolution 104, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 8, 1936, and now ratified by the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, which compact reads as follows:

"NEW ENGLAND INTERSTATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMPACT

"Whereas the growth of population and the development of the territory of the New England States has resulted in serious pollution of certain interstate streams, ponds, and lakes, and of tidal waters ebbing and flowing past the boundaries of two or more States; and

"Whereas such pollution constitutes a menace to the health, welfare, and economic prosperity of the people living in such area; and

"Whereas the abatement of existing pollution and the control of future pollution in the interstate waters of the New England area are of prime importance to the people and can best be accomplished through the cooperation of the New England States in the establishment of an interstate agency to work with the States in the field of pollution abatement;

"Now, therefore, the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont do agree and are bound as follows:

"ARTICLE I

"It is agreed between the signatory States that the provisions of this compact shall apply to streams, ponds, and lakes which are contiguous to two or more signatory States or which flow through two or more signatory States or which have a tributary contiguous to two or more signatory States or flowing through two or more signatory States, and also shall apply to tidal waters ebbing and flowing past the boundaries of two States.

"ARTICLE II

"There is hereby created the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission (hereinafter referred to as the commission) which shall be a body corporate and politic, having the powers, duties, and jurisdiction herein enumerated and such other and additional powers as shall be conferred upon it by the act or acts of a signatory State concurred in by the others.

"ARTICLE III

"The commission shall consist of five commissioners from each signatory State, each of whom shall be a resident voter of the State from which he is appointed. The commissioners shall be chosen in the manner and for the terms provided by law of the State from which they shall be appointed. For each State there shall be on the commission a member representing the State health department, a member representing the State water pollution control board (if such exists), and, except where a State in its enabling legislation decides that the best interests of the State will be otherwise served, a member representing municipal interests, a member representing industrial interests, and a member representing an agency acting for fisheries or conservation.

"ARTICLE IV

"The commission shall annually elect from its members a chairman and vice chairman and shall appoint and at its pleasure remove or discharge such officers. It may appoint and employ a secretary who shall be a professional engineer versed in water pollution and may employ such stenographic or clerical employees as shall be necessary, and at its pleasure remove or discharge such employees. It shall adopt a seal and suitable bylaws and shall promulgate rules and regulations for its management and control. It may maintain an office for the transaction of its business and may meet at any time or place within the signatory States. Meetings shall be held at least twice each year. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but no action of the commission imposing any obligation on any signatory State or on any municipal agency or subdivision thereof or on any person, firm, or corporation therein shall be binding unless a majority of the members from such signatory State shall have voted in favor thereof. Where meetings are planned to discuss matters relevant to problems of water pollution control affecting only certain of the signatory States, the commission may vote to authorize special meetings of the commissioners of the States especially concerned. The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements and shall make an annual report to the governor and the legislature of each signatory State setting forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it pursuant to this compact, and shall make recommendations for any legislative action deemed by it advisable, including amendments to the statutes of the signatory States which may be necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of this compact. The commission shall not incur any obligations for salaries, office, administrative, traveling, or other expenses prior to the allotment of funds by the signatory States adequate to meet the same; nor shall the commission pledge the credit of any of the signatory States. Each signatory State reserves the right to provide hereafter by law for the examination and audit of the accounts of the commission. The commission shall appoint a treasurer who may be a member of the commission, and disbursements by the commission shall be valid only when authorized by the commission and when vouchers therefor have been signed by the secretary and countersigned by the treasurer. The secretary shall be custodian of the records of the commission with authority to attest to and certify such records or copies thereof.

"ARTICLE V

"It is recognized, owing to such variable factors as location, size, character, and flow and the many varied uses of the waters subject to the terms of this compact, that no single standard of sewage and waste treatment and no single standard of quality of receiving waters is practical and that the degree of treatment of sewage and industrial wastes should take into account the classification of the receiving waters according to present and proposed highest use, such as for drinking water supply, industrial and agricultural uses, bathing and other recreational purposes, maintenance and propagation of fish life, shellfish culture, navigation, and disposal of wastes.

"The commission shall establish reasonable physical, chemical, and bacteriological standards of water quality satisfactory for various classifications of use. It is agreed that each of the signatory States through appropriate agencies will prepare a classification of its interstate waters in entirety or by portions according to present and proposed highest use and for this purpose technical experts employed by State departments of health and State water pollution control agencies are authorized to confer on questions relating to classification of interstate waters affecting two or more States. Each signatory State agrees to submit its classification of its interstate waters to the commission for approval. It is agreed that after such approval all signatory States through their appropriate State health departments and water pollution control agencies will work to establish programs of treatment of sewage and industrial wastes which will meet standards established by the commission for classified waters. The commission may from time to time make such changes in definitions of classifications and in standards as may be required by changed conditions or as may be necessary for uniformity.

"ARTICLE VI

"Each of the signatory states pledges to provide for the abatement of existing pollution and for the control of future pollution of interstate inland and tidal waters as described in article I, and to put and maintain the waters thereof in a satisfactory condition consistent with the highest classified use of each body of water.

"ARTICLE VII

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to repeal or prevent the enactment of any legislation or prevent the enforcement of any requirement by any signatory State imposing any additional condition or restriction to further lessen the pollution of waters within its jurisdiction. Nothing herein contained shall affect or abate any action now pending brought by any governmental board or body created by or existing under any of the signatory States.

"ARTICLE VIII

"The signatory States agree to appropriate for the salaries, office, administrative, travel, and other expenses such sum or sums as shall be recommended by the commission. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts obligates itself only to the extent of $6,500 in any one year, the State of Connecticut only to the extent of $3,000 in any one year, the State of Rhode Island only to the extent of $1,500 in any one year, and the States of New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont each only to the extent of $1,000 in any one year.

"ARTICLE IX

"Should any part of this compact be held to be contrary to the constitution of any signatory State or of the United States, all other parts thereof shall continue to be in full force and effect.

"ARTICLE X

"The commission is authorized to discuss with appropriate State agencies in New York State questions of pollution of waters which flow into the New England area from New York State or vice versa and to further the establishment of agreements on pollution abatement to promote the interests of the New York and New England areas.

"Whenever the commission by majority vote of the members of each signatory State shall have given its approval and the State of New York shall have taken the necessary action to do so, the State of New York shall be a party to this compact for the purpose of controlling and abating the pollution of waterways common to New York and the New England States signatory to this compact but excluding the waters under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Sanitation Commission (New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut).

"ARTICLE XI

"This compact shall become effective immediately upon the adoption of the compact by any two contiguous States of New England but only insofar as applies to those States and upon approval by Federal law. Thereafter upon ratification by other contiguous States it shall also become effective as to those States."

SEC. 2. Without further submission of the compact, the consent of Congress is given to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, and to the State of New York pursuant to article X of the compact, to enter into the

compact as a signatory State and party thereto.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this act or in the compact herein approved shall be construed as impairing or affecting the sovereignty of the United States or any of its rights or jurisdiction in and over the area or waters which are the subject of the compact.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

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 was laid on the table.

QUIETING TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND IN PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4115) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill do?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman, may I say this bill simply quiets title to a small parcel of land that was deeded to the United States by someone recently. The United States has no use for it. The report shows that the bill was reported unanimously by our committee.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby releases the quitclaims to Walter N. Campbell and Zenobia Campbell, husband and wife, all the right, title, and interest, if any, of the United States of America in and to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md., more particularly described in a deed which purported to convey such land to the United States of America as follows: The southerly 12 1/10 feet front, extended by the same width, the full length thereof lot No. 1431, and the northerly 46 feet front, extended by the same width, the full length thereof of lot No. 1432 all in block 63 of section 9 of the subdivision known as Cheverly, according to the official plot and survey thereof of record among the land records of said county; such deed being executed on December 28, 1942, by the said Walter N. Campbell and Zenobia Campbell, and recorded in the land records of such county in liber No. 694 beginning at folio 48.

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.

DELAWARE RIVER JOINT TOLL BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4140) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to permit the State of New Jersey and the State of Pennsylvania to enter into an agreement for the building of a toll bridge across the Delaware River. It was unanimously reported out by our committee, the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. DONDERO. It was unanimously reported by our committee.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. This is merely an extension of the authority that the Joint Bridge Commission now has?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Under the Reorganization Act, are not these bills supposed to be handled administratively, without having to come before the Congress?

Mr. DONDERO. This is a compact between two States.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGON. The gentleman's motion is to adopt this bill with a committee amendment?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

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

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact or agreement set forth below, and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, over or in regard to any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of the aforesaid compact or agreement or otherwise affected by the terms thereof.

"SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

"AMENDING THE AGREEMENT ENTITLED 'AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY CREATING THE DELAWARE RIVER JOINT TOLL BRIDGE COMMISSION AS A BODY CORPORATE AND POLITIC AND DEFINING ITS POWERS AND DUTIES', BY EXTENDING THE JURISDICTION, POWERS, AND DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION AND DEFINING SUCH ADDITIONAL JURISDICTION, POWERS, AND DUTIES

"Whereas, the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'commission') was created by a compact or agreement entitled 'Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties,' executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 19th day of December, 1934, pursuant to an act of its general assembly approved the 25th day of June, 1931 (pamphlet laws, 1352), as last amended by an act of said general assembly approved the 18th day of May, 1933 (pamphlet laws, 827), and executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 18th day of December, 1934, pursuant to an act of its Senate and general assembly approved June 11, 1934 (ch. 215, laws of 1934; R. S. (1937) 32:8–1), to which compact or agreement the consent of the Congress of the United States was given by section 9 of an act of the Congress approved August 30, 1935 (Public No. 411, 74th Cong., 49 Stat. 1051, 1058), and under the provisions of which compact or agreement the commission was authorized to administer, maintain and operate certain bridges over the Delaware River and now maintains and operates the same as joint State-owned free bridges; and

"Whereas because of the great increase in traffic and loads over said bridges since their construction, many of said bridges are now inadequate or unsafe, and it will be necessary to rehabilitate or replace some or all of said bridges with new bridges at the same or different locations in order to provide safe, adequate and convenient facilities for traffic crossing the Delaware River; and

"Whereas it is necessary that the commission have power to issue and sell its bridge revenue bonds, for rehabilitating or replacing existing bridges with new bridges at the same or different locations, for acquiring or constructing additional bridges, and for refunding any bridge revenue bonds of the commission, and that the commission also have power to fix, charge and collect tolls, rates, rents and other charges for the use of any such new bridge or bridges; now therefore,

"The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby solemnly covenant and agree, each with the other, as follows:

"(1) Article IX of the agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties, which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 19th day of December, 1934, and was executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 18th day of December, 1934, be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"ARTICLE IX

"The commission shall make annual reports to the Governors and Legislatures of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, setting forth in detail its operations and transactions, and may make such additional reports, from time to time, to the governors and legislatures as it may deem advisable.

"(2) Article X of said agreement be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"ARTICLE X

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this agreement the commission shall have the following powers:

"(a) The commission may acquire, construct, rehabilitate, improve, maintain, repair, and operate bridges for vehicular or pedestrian traffic across the Delaware River between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey at any locations north of the boundary line between Mercer County and Burlington County in the State of New Jersey as extended across the Dela-

ware River to the Pennsylvania shore of said river.

"(b) The commission may replace any one or more existing bridges across the Delaware River between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey north of said line with one or more new bridges at such locations as the Commission may determine to be adequate and convenient for the traffic to be served thereby.

"(c) The commission may acquire by purchase or by the exercise of the power of eminent domain any existing ferry or bridge the acquisition of which the commission may determine to be necessary or advisable in connection with the construction of a new bridge, the cost of such acquisition to be deemed to be a part of the cost of such construction.

"(d) The commission may enter upon, use, occupy, enlarge, construct, and improve any street, road, or highway located within the limits of any municipality and deemed by the commission to be necessary in connection with the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, or operation of any bridge owned or operated by the commission or of any bridge approaches, bridge plazas, or approach highways to any such bridge, subject, however, to the consent of the governing body of such municipality and to such reasonable police regulations as may be established by such governing body.

"(e) The commission may demolish and remove any bridge now operated by it when such bridge has been or is being replaced by a new bridge at the same or a different location which in the determination of the commission will serve substantially the same traffic as that served by such existing bridge, and the commission may sell or otherwise dispose of any ferry or other property of the commission deemed by it to be no longer useful or needed for the purposes of the commission.

"(f) The commission may acquire for the purposes of this article any real property which it shall find necessary or convenient to acquire for public use in the manner provided by article III of this agreement or, in the alternative, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the same manner and with the same right of entry as the highway department of the Commonwealth may acquire lands by condemnation for highway purposes and in the State of New Jersey in the same manner and with the same right of entry as the highway department of the State may acquire lands by condemnation for highway purposes.

"(g) The commission may make and enforce such rules and regulations with respect to the use of any bridge operated by it as it shall deem proper and reasonable, including regulations limiting the loads permitted on any such bridge and closing to traffic any such bridge deemed by the commission to be unsafe.

"(h) The commission may provide, from time to time, for the issuance of its bridge revenue bonds for any one or more of the following purposes: (1) providing funds for the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation or improvement of any one or more bridges the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation or improvement of which is herein authorized; (2) providing funds for the construction or improvement of approach facilities deemed by the commission to be necessary or desirable in connection with the acquisition, construction, maintenance or operation of any bridge owned or operated by the commission, including but without limitation bridge approaches, entrance plazas, overpasses, underpasses and approach highways; and (3) refunding any bridge revenue bonds or bridge revenue refunding bonds of the commission. The bridge or bridges (including any approach facilities) on account of which a single issue of bonds shall be issued as herein authorized shall constitute a single project for financing purposes.

"(i) The commission may fix, charge, and collect tolls, rates, rents, and other charges for the use of any bridge or bridges constituting a single project, such tolls to be so fixed and adjusted, subject to any applicable Federal law, as to provide funds at least sufficient (1) to pay the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating such bridge or bridges, including the administrative expenses of the commission chargeable thereto, (2) to pay the bridge revenue bonds or the bridge revenue refunding bonds issued on account of such project and the interest on such bonds, and (3) to provide reserves for such purposes; provided, however, that no tolls shall be charged or collected for the use of any bridge now operated by the commission as a free bridge but only for the use of bridges constructed or acquired by the commission under the provisions of this compact or agreement. Subject to any applicable Federal law, the commission may pledge such tolls, rates, rents and other revenues or any part thereof for such purposes. The commission may establish separate schedules of tolls, rates, and charges for use of any bridge on which tolls may be established hereunder by residents of areas adjacent to or served directly by such bridge under such conditions and on such terms as it shall determine to be proper and reasonable, including tolls, rates, and charges for unlimited use of any such bridge.

"No member of the commission shall be subject to any personal liability or accountability by reason of any act or omission of the commission.

"In witness whereof, this 3d day of July 1947, Alfred E. Driscoll has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the State of New Jersey and caused the great seal of the State to be attached thereto.

"ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
[SEAL] *"Governor, State of New Jersey.*

"And, on this 8th day of July 1947, James H. Duff has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and caused the great seal of the Commonwealth to be attached thereto.

"JAS. H. DUFF,
"Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."
[GREAT SEAL]

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, after "thereof", insert *"And provided further,* That after the costs of the bridges in a single project have been amortized, such bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls."

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.

SURPLUS WAR DEPARTMENT-OWNED MILITARY REAL PROPERTY FOR NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 272) to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the bill does?

Mr. WELCH. The bill provides for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries. Under the amendment which will be offered, it limits the expansion of two military cemeteries, one at Fort Rosecrans, Calif., and the other at Jefferson Barracks, Mo.

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

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I say these are national cemeteries which are now in existence. Adjacent to those cemeteries there is acreage owned by the Government, and it is purely an expansion matter. There are no new cemeteries. It is just an expansion of two old cemeteries. It is without the acquisition of any property. The property is now owned by the Government.

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

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is this thing limited to these two cemeteries?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is limited to these two cemeteries.

Mr. RANKIN. That crazy order issued by the War Department recently forbidding race segregation in national cemeteries has virtually closed those cemeteries to the white boys of the South. If you want to make this an individual proposition, all right, but I do not want any such measure as this covering the whole country.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I say I have four telegrams here. They have bodies there and there are no graves to put them in. It is an emergency situation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman tell us how much money is involved?

Mr. WELCH. There are no funds involved.

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

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. What is the acreage involved in these cemeteries?

Mr. WELCH. I do not recall the acreage in the Jefferson Barracks. Fort Rosecrans, Calif., has 34 acres.

Mr. BUCK. What is the acreage at Jefferson Barracks?

Mr. WELCH. I do not remember the exact acreage.

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

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I spoke to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], in whose district the Jefferson Barracks is located, and he said they would probably want about 50 acres. They have a large acreage, but they would need only about 50 acres in addition to the present national cemetery.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. What I am trying to find out is what is in the amendment that is going to be proposed.

Mr. WELCH. If the gentleman will withhold his right to object until the amendment is read, I am sure he will approve the bill as amended.

Mr. RANKIN. It will have to be rather convincing.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve my objection until I can find out what is in the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves the right to object.

Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELCH:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "utilize", insert the words "and expand existing facilities."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "practicable", insert "through the use of."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "to", strike out the words "establish thereon" and insert the words "expand existing."

And on page 2, line 7, after the word "maintenance", strike out "of such cemeteries" and insert the word "thereof."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "cemetery", strike out the word "established" and insert the words "as expanded."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentlemen from California, either one or both of them, if this applies to the entire country?

Mr. WELCH. No; it is confined to two cemeteries.

Mr. RANKIN. Where is it limited to two?

Mr. WELCH. It is limited to two under the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I want to find out, if it is limited to two cemeteries; and if so, which two.

The War Department, as I said, has issued a crazy order which has virtually closed national cemeteries to the white boys of the Southern States, and probably a great many other States. I am not going to let this measure pass if it is to be Nation-wide in its scope.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests to the gentleman from California that he withdraw his request.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the War Department letter made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, that ought to be put in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests to the gentleman that the bill be withdrawn until these differences are ironed out.

Mr. RANKIN. Let him write it into the bill.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

IMPLEMENTING PATENT PROVISIONS OF PEACE TREATIES WITH ITALY, BULGARIA, HUNGARY, AND RUMANIA

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes. This came out of the Committee on the Judiciary. It simply extends the provisions of the Boykin Act of last year to Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe the State Department has requested the passage of this bill.

Mr. LEWIS. The State Department and the Patent Office.

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 international Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of 1883, as amended, is considered as reestablished and in full force and effect between the United States and Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania from the date of this act and the nationals of the latter countries may hereafter apply for and obtain patents in the United States for their inventions and enjoy the rights and privileges thereof as provided in article 2 of said convention: *Provided, however,* That patents shall not be applied for or obtained, or if obtained, shall not be valid, for inventions relating to war materials as specified in article 6 of annex XV A of the Treaty of Peace with Italy, article 6 of annex IV of the Treaty of Peace with Bulgaria, article 6 of annex IV A of the Treaty of Peace with Hungary, and article 6 of annex IV A of the Treaty of Peace with Rumania.

SEC. 2. The rights of priority and the times for the taking of any action specified in sections 1 and 3 of Public Law 690, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 8, 1946, which had not expired on December 8, 1941, or which commenced after such date, shall be and are hereby extended until February 29, 1948, in favor of nationals of Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, subject to the conditions and limitations specified in sections 1, 3, 4, and 10 of said Public Law 690.

SEC. 3. Nationals of Germany and Japan may hereafter apply for and obtain patents in the United States for their inventions in accordance with the patent laws and enjoy the rights and privileges thereof: *Provided, however,* That patents obtained for such inventions shall be subject to any conditions and limitations with respect to duration, revocation, utilization, assignment, and licensing which may be imposed by Congress, or by the President, patents may not be applied for or obtained, or if obtained, shall not be valid, for any invention made, or upon which an application was filed by any such national, before January 1, 1946, in Germany or Japan or in the territory of any other of the Axis Powers or in any territory occupied by the Axis forces.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "inventions", insert the words "heretofore made."

Page 2, line 17, after the figures "690", insert *"Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall affect any act which has been or shall be done by virtue of special measures taken under legislative, executive, administrative, or military authority of the United States during World War II."

Page 3, line 4, after the word "President", insert "in accordance with the provisions of any peace treaty hereafter entered into with Germany or Japan: *And provided further,".*

Page 3, line 6, after the word "That," insert "except for patents based on applications filed in the United States Patent Office prior to the date of enactment of this Act,".

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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject Federal Aid for Education and include a statement.

Mr. DAWSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio statement.

AMENDMENT TO ARMED FORCES LEAVE ACT OF 1946

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3501) to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 3, line 18, strike out "excluding" and insert "and."

Page 3, line 19, after "discharge", insert "including for enlisted persons the allowances as provided for such enlisted persons in subsection (a) of this section."

Page 5, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 12 on page 6.

Page 6, line 13, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 6, line 23, strike out "5" and insert "4."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPLORATION, INVESTIGATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND MAINTENANCE OF FISHING RESOURCES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 859) to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, line 15, after "Hawaii", insert ": *Provided further,* That there are authorized to be transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service not to exceed three surplus vessels suitable for conversion and use in oceanographic and bilological research and exploratory fishing, by any disposal agency of the Government without reimbursement or transfer of funds."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIDELITY TRUST CO., OF BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 892) for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what amount is involved and does the full committee from which this comes approve of it?

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

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

Mr. CHURCH. This bill has been passed by the official objectors. There was some misunderstanding with reference to it the other day and I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. RICH. Has the committee in charge approved it?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, and the official objectors have also approved it.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman's word is good, but where are you going to get the money?

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to receive, consider, and allow without interest the claims as hereinafter set forth for the refund of bankers' special taxes paid under the War Revenue Act of June 13, 1898, and under the Emergency Revenue Act of October 22, 1914, and later held to have been erroneously and illegally collected by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the *Fidelity and Deposit Company* v. *United States* (259 U. S. 296) and the *United States* v. *Fidelity and Deposit Company* (266 U. S. 587), which claims are covered by the findings of fact made on June 5, 1944, by the United States Court of Claims and reported at pages 13, 14, and 15 of Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as follows:

17767. Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., $2,116.86.

17768. Maryland Trust Co., successors to Continental Trust Co., Baltimore, Md., $3,323.30.

17769. Baltimore Trust Corp., liquidating agent of Baltimore Trust Co., Baltimore, Md., $3,409.34.

17770. Safe Deposit & Trust Co. of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., $66.

17771. Union Trust Co. of Maryland, Baltimore, Md., $867.67.

17772. Citizens National Trust & Savings Bank of Los Angeles, successors to Citizens Trust & Savings Co., Los Angeles, Calif., $1,108.92.

17773. Wells Fargo Bank & Union Trust Co., successors to Union Trust Co. of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif., $1,074.90.

17774. International Trust Co., Denver, Colo., $993.50.

17775. Phoenix State Bank & Trust Co., successors to State Bank, Hartford, Conn., $397.42.

17776. Stamford Trust Co., Stamford, Conn., $636.17.

17778. Citizens Bank & Trust Co., Tampa, Fla., $323.50.

17779. Harris Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., $4,219.80.

17780. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Continenal & Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., $5,179.17.

17781. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Hibernian Banking Association, Chicago, Ill., $2,170.

17782. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Illinois Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., $9,512.

17783. Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, successors to Illinois Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill., $10,706.23.

17784. Peoples Trust & Saving Co., Fort Wayne, Ind., $155.04.

17785. Security Trust Co., Indianapolis, Ind., $153.34.

17786. First National Bank & Trust Co., successors to Phoenix & Third Trust Co., Lexington, Ky., $104.

17787. State Bank & Trust Co., Richmond, Ky., $154.50.

17789. Franklin County Trust Co., Greenfield, Mass., $75.99.

17790. Security Trust Co., Lynn, Mass., $148.26.

17791. Berkshire Trust Co., formerly Berkshire Loan & Trust Co., Pittsfield, Mass., $117.99.

17792. Springfield Safe Deposit & Trust Co., Springfield, Mass., $170.67.

17793. Detroit Trust Co., successors to Security Trust Co., Detroit, Mich., $1,392.50.

17794. Union Guardian Trust Co., successors to Union Trust Co., Detroit, Mich., $440.50.

17795. Mercantile Commerce Bank & Trust Co., formerly Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo., $197.49.

17796. Mercantile Commerce Bank & Trust Co., formerly Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo., $9,283.50.

17797. Mississippi Valley Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo., $8,223.84.

17799. Hudson Trust Co., Union City, N. J., $2,036.25.

17800. Paterson Savings Institution, Paterson, N. J., $2,438.

17802. Morristown Trust Co., Morristown, N. J., $2,737.45.

17803. Cumberland National Bank of Bridgeton, successors to the Cumberland Trust Co., of Bridgeton, Bridgeton, N. J., $100.46.

17804. Brooklyn Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., $1,525.

17805. Kings County Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., $2,864.57.

17806. National City Bank of New York, successors to Peoples Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., $570.50.

17807. Marine Trust Co. of Buffalo, successors to Buffalo Trust Co., Buffalo, N. Y., $101.

17808. Marine Trust Co. of Buffalo, successors to Bankers Trust Co., Buffalo, N. Y., $878.51.

17809. Chemical Bank & Trust Co., successors to United States Mortgage & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., $3,845.50.

17810. Title Guarantee & Trust Co. of New York City, N. Y., successors to Manufacturers Trust Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., $3,798.

17811. Bank of New York, successors to Bank of New York & Trust Co., successors to New York Life Insurance & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., $16,502.52.

17812. Bank of New York, successors to Bank of New York & Trust Co., successors to New York Life Insurance & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., $7,300.

17813. Lawyers Trust Co., successors to Central Realty Bond & Trust Co., New York City, N. Y., $1,078.75.

17814. United States Trust Co. of New York, New York City, N. Y., $15,706.50.

17816. First Trust & Deposit Co., successors to Trust & Deposit Co. of Onondaga, Syracuse, N. Y., $1,555.17.

17817. First Trust & Deposit Co., successors to City Bank Trust Co., successors to Central City Trust Co., Syracuse, N. Y., $132.11.

17818. First Trust & Deposit Co., successors to City Bank Trust Co., successors to Central City Trust Co., Syracuse, N. Y., $438.67.

17819. City Savings Bank & Trust Co., Alliance, Ohio, $226.32.

17820. Fifth Third Union Trust Co., successors to Union Savings Bank & Trust Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, $1,836.33.

17821. Central National Bank, successors to Central United National Bank, successors to the United Banking & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, $0.00.

17822. Central National Bank, successors to Central United National Bank, successors to the United Banking & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, $1,297.99.

17823. Union Trust Co., successors to the Broadway Savings & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, $734.01.

17824. Union Trust Co., successors to the State Banking & Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, $565.67.

17825. Toledo Trust Co., formerly Toledo Savings Bank & Trust Co., Toledo, Ohio, $622.67.

17826. Easton Trust Co., Easton, Pa., $502.67.

17827. Central Trust Co., Harrisburg, Pa., $210.01.

17828. Harrisburg Trust Co., Harrisburg, Pa., $545.50.

17829. Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co., successors to Logan Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $1,706.81.

17830. Germantown Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $459.33.

17831. Girard Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $10,859.33.

17832. Liberty Title & Trust Co., successors to German American Title & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $1,147.03.

17833. Liberty Title & Trust Co., successors to German American Title & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $1,794.

17834. United Security Trust Co., formerly United Security Life Insurance & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $0.00.

17835. United Security Trust Co., formerly United Security Life Insurance & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $8,136.61.

17836. Integrity Trust Co., successors to the West Philadelphia Title & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $932.33.

17837. Fidelity Trust Co., formerly Fidelity Title & Trust Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., $1,932.94.

17838. Miners' National Bank of Wilkes-Barre, successors to Wyoming Valley Trust Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa., $805.16.

17839. First National Bank, successors to Sunbury Trust & Safe Deposit Co., Sunbury, Pa., $416.66.

17840. Wakefield Trust Co., Wakefield, R. I., $669.

17841. Zion's Saving Bank & Trust Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, $712.

17843. Lynchburg Trust & Savings Bank, Lynchburg, Va., $162.90.

17844. Spokane & Eastern Trust Co., Spokane, Wash., $426.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the claims allowed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue pursuant to the preceding section of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 20 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and any such payment

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS WAR DEPARTMENT-OWNED MILITARY REAL PROPERTY AS NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 272) to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned military real property as national cemeteries, when feasible.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will withdraw my reservation of objection with the understanding that the amendments to be offered will apply to those two cemeteries only.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when the Secretary of War determines that there is need for an additional cemetery or cemeteries for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable and certain other persons as provided for by existing law (24 U. S. C. 281), he is authorized to utilize, when practicable, federally owned lands under the jurisdiction of the War Department for military purposes and not needed for such purposes for the establishment thereon of a national cemetery or cemeteries.

SEC. 2. Upon the selection by the Secretary of War of such land, as provided in section 1 hereof, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish thereon national cemeteries and to provide for the care and maintenance of such cemeteries. No national cemetery established pursuant to this act shall have an area in excess of 640 acres.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary for the administration of this act.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this act.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELCH:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "utilize", insert "and expand existing facilities at Fort Rosecrans, Calif., and Jefferson Barracks, Mo., and on page 1, line 9, after the word "practicable", insert "through the use of."

On page 2, line 5, after the word "to", strike out the words "establish thereon" and insert the words "expand existing" and on page 2, line 7, after the word "maintenance", strike out the words "of such cemeteries" and insert the word "thereof."

On page 2, line 7, after the word "cemetery", strike out word "established" and insert words "as expanded."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I think I should explain to the House the reason for my attitude on this measure.

The War Department recently issued an order forbidding race segregation in our national cemeteries.

That simply means the closing of the national cemeteries to the white boys of the Southern States and a large portion of the rest of the country. The white boys of the South will hereafter be buried in the local cemeteries.

For that reason I am not willing to have this program expanded throughout the entire country. I agreed to withdraw my objection with the understanding that the gentleman from California would offer this amendment limiting it to the western cemeteries.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

The amendments were agreed to.

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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD four telegrams.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. The telegrams referred to are as follows:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *July 22, 1947.*

Hon. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Report just received. All grave space for veterans' purposes at national cemetery, Fort Rosecrans, has been used. Urgently request expedite action allocation additional ground for graves. Notwithstanding reallocation of overseas war dead need is immediate as veterans of San Diego County are dying now.

B. G. HAMBLIN,
Executive Secretary,
San Diego County Council of Veterans.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *July 22, 1947.*

Hon. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
Congressman:

No more graves in Rosecrans. Bodies waiting burial in private cemeteries. Immediate action requested.

WALTER J. PARKER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *July 23, 1947.*

Hon. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
House of Representatives:

Rosecrans cemetery situation critical. Urge passage your bill this session.

SAN DIEGO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *July 22, 1947.*

Hon. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery closed today. San Diego situation critical. Veterans awaiting burial. Request immediate action on development of additional acreage.

R. J. COSGRIFF,
Service Officer, Chapter No. 2,
Disabled American Veterans.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3394, "An act 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," do pass with the following Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after "War", insert ", except as expressly reserved to the American Battle Monuments Commission by section 9 of this act."

Page 5, after line 16, insert:

"SEC. 9. The American Battle Monuments Commission shall be solely responsible for the permanent design and construction of the cemeteries to be established in foreign countries under section 5 of this act and of all buildings, plantings, headstones, and other permanent improvements incidental thereto. The Secretary of War is authorized to undertake such temporary construction as will be necessary for the accomplishment of this act and to maintain such cemeteries in a suitable condition until such time as the functions of administration thereof shall pass to the American Battle Monuments Commission in accordance with section 12 of Public Law 456, Seventy-ninth Congress, or any other law."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND OF THE NAVY

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3215, an act to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after "Section", insert "the Sanitary Engineering Section."

Page 4, line 1, strike out all after "Surgeon" down to and including "promotion" in line 8 and insert "General, and each person appointed and commissioned an officer of the Medical Service Corps who at the time of appointment holds a degree of doctor of philosophy or comparable degree recognized by the Surgeon General in a science allied

to medicine may, subject to regulations as prescribed by the Secretary of War, be credited at the time of appointment with an amount of service equal to 3 years."

Page 11, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 11 on page 12 and insert:

" 'Hereafter the authorized strength of the Hospital Corps of the Navy shall equal 3½ percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to establish such grades and ratings in the Hospital Corps as he may deem necessary in the proper administration of such corps: *Provided*, That enlisted men of other ratings in the Navy and in the Marine Corps shall be eligible for transfer to the Hospital Corps, and men of that corps to other ratings in the Navy and the Marine Corps.' "

Page 12, strike out all after line 13 down to and including line 17 and insert "The Secretary of the Navy may hereafter appoint as many warrant officers in the Hospital Corps, as may be deemed necessary, from the rating of chief petty officer or petty officer, first class, in the Hospital Corps: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed."

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation of this measure?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3215 passed the House unanimously some time ago. It went over to the Senate and was amended only for the purpose of bringing it in conformity with the provisions of the promotion bill recently acted upon.

In its consideration of H. R. 3215, the Senate Armed Services Committee adopted three amendments, one of which was proposed by the Army and the other two by the Navy.

The sole purpose of the Army amendment is to bring the provisions of H. R. 3215 into conformity with the provisions of the promotion bill, H. R. 3830.

The Navy amendments go to title III of the bill and are made for the purpose of bringing the language of this bill into conformity with the present policy of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in determining the appropriate names to be applied to members in the Hospital Corps. The Bureau of Naval Personnel desires administrative flexibility in this regard and there appears to be no reason why the request should not be granted.

Another amendment approved by the Senate would add a "Sanitary Engineer Section". There is no objection to this. In fact testimony at the hearings indicated that other sections would be added as needed under the authority of this bill. In connection with the Senate committee amendment, I would like to include correspondence in explanation.

H. R. 3215, "To revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes" is now on its way to the President for his signature.

The Navy Department writes me that the words "pharmacists" or "pharmacists' mates" will not be used in describing the titles of the grades and ratings in the Hospital Corps of the Navy.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1947.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. SMITH: Enclosed for your information is a copy of a letter which I have transmitted to Mr. George H. Frates, the Washington representative of the National Association of Retail Druggists, assuring him that the Navy Department will not continue to describe members of the Hospital Corps of the Navy as "pharmacists" or "pharmacists' mates" should the bill H. R. 3215 be enacted in the form in which it was reported to the Senate.

The Navy Department requested the Senate Committee on Armed Services to amend title III of the bill for reasons which do not go to the substance of the measure but for reasons which have only to do with its practical administration. These reasons are:

(a) There is a possibility of having no legal authority for membership in the Hospital Corps at all during the interim necessary to shift from one nomenclature to another.

(b) The most appropriate new names to be applied to the members of the Hospital Corps have not been determined.

(c) The names of other ratings in the Navy are not frozen by statute. Administrative flexibility in fixing such names is desirable. Had there been such flexibility in the case of pharmacists' mates, a change in the law would not be necessary at this time. The Secretary of the Navy could have made the change by administrative action.

Very respectfully,

IRA H. NUNN,
Legislative Counsel.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1947.

Mr. GEORGE H. FRATES,
National Association of Retail Druggists,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FRATES: This letter is to confirm our telephone conversation of yesterday during which I assured you that, if and when the bill H. R. 3215, "To revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes" becomes law in the form in which it has been reported to the Senate, the Navy Department will not employ the words "pharmacist" or "pharmacists' mates" in describing the titles of the grades and ratings in the Hospital Corps of the Navy. The Navy Department will, on the other hand, abandon the use of those terms for the purpose for which they are now employed as soon as practicable after any act of the Congress becomes law which alters the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, as amended, so as to permit other phraseology to be used in designating the grades and ratings of the Hospital Corps of the Navy.

You will note that an amendment to title III of the bill, H. R. 3215, which was adopted by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate at the request of the Navy Department will, if enacted, amend the act of August 29, 1916, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Navy "to establish such grades and ratings in the Hospital Corps as he may deem necessary," thus providing adequate authority to abandon the present restrictive phraseology.

I am aware of the interest of the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH and of the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM, both Members of the House of Representatives, in this matter and am sending a copy of this letter to each in order that they may be advised of the intentions of the Navy Department.

Sincerely yours,

IRA H. NUNN,
Captain, USN,
Legislative Counsel.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO STATE OF DELAWARE OF A PORTION OF PEA PATCH ISLAND

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1480) authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Delaware all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to Pea Patch Island, situated in the Delaware River, near Delaware City, Del., except that portion of the island lying northeastwardly of a straight line just northeastwardly from the northeast outside wall of the Fort Delaware moat and 80 feet northeastwardly at right angles from triangulation station "Torpedo" from a point in the southeasterly high-water line to a point in the northwesterly high-water line of the island, reserving to the United States a perpetual easement to construct and operate on the east fire-control station of the fort parapet a navigational light and fog signal with necessary appurtenances, and a perpetual easement to construct and maintain a submarine cable from the water on the southeasterly side of the island to the light and fog-signal apparatus.

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.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1326) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Commencing with crops planted for harvest in 1948, for the purpose of determining the most practical plan, terms, and conditions of insurance for agricultural commodities, if sufficient actuarial data are available, as determined by the Board, to insure, or to reinsure insurers of, producers of such agricultural commodities under any plan or plans of insurance determined by the Board to be adapted to any such commodity. Such insurance shall be against loss of the insured commodity while in the field due to unavoidable causes, including drought, flood, hail, wind, frost, winterkill, lightning, fire, excessive rain, snow, wildlife, hurricane, tornado, insect infestation, plant disease, and such other unavoidable causes as may be determined by the Board. Any insurance offered against loss in yield shall not cover in excess of 75 percent of the recorded or appraised average yield of the commodity on the insured farm for a representative period subject to such adjustments as the Board may prescribe to the end that the average yields

fixed for farms in the same area, which are subject to the same conditions, may be fair and just: *Provided*, That, if 75 percent of the average yield represents generally more protection than the investment in the crop in any area, taking into consideration recognized farming practices, the Board shall reduce such maximum percentage so as more nearly to reflect the investment in the crop in such area. Insurance provided under this subsection shall not cover losses due to the neglect or malfeasance of the producer, or to the failure of the producer to reseed to the same crop in areas and under circumstances where it is customary to so reseed, or to the failure of the producer to follow established good farming practices. In 1948 insurance shall be limited to not more than seven crops (including wheat, cotton, flax, corn, and tobacco) and to not more than three additional crops in each year thereafter. Insurance provided for any agricultural commodity, except wheat, cotton, flax, corn, and tobacco, shall be limited to producers in not to exceed 20 counties. Insurance for wheat, corn, and cotton shall be limited to producers in not to exceed 50 counties, and for flax and tobacco to producers in not to exceed 25 counties, for each such commodity. Counties selected by the Board shall be representative of the several areas where the agricultural commodity insured is normally produced. Insurance shall not be provided in any county unless written applications therefor are filed covering at least 200 farms or one-third of the farms normally producing the agricultural commodity; nor shall insurance of any agricultural commodity be provided in any county in which the Board determines that the income from such commodity constitutes an unimportant part of the total agricultural income of the county. The Board may limit or refuse insurance in any county or area, or on any farm, on the basis of the insurance risk involved. The Corporation shall report annually to the Congress the results of its operations as to each commodity insured."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That such premiums may be established on the basis of the parity or comparable price for the commodity as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture, or on the basis of an average market price designated by the Board."

SEC. 3. Subsection (c) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in the first sentence "however," and inserting in lieu thereof "That indemnities may be determined on the same price basis as premiums are determined for the crop with respect to which such indemnities are paid: *Provided further*,".

SEC. 4. Section 502 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 502. It is the purpose of this title to promote the national welfare by improving the economic stability of agriculture through a sound system of crop insurance and providing the means for the research and experience helpful in devising and establishing such insurance."

SEC. 5. Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect the validity of any insurance contract entered into prior to the enactment of this act insofar as such contract covers the 1947 crop year. Any such contract which purports to cover a crop in the 1948 or any subsequent crop year in any county in which insurance on such crop will be discontinued pursuant to this act is hereby terminated at the end of the 1947 crop year.

SEC. 6. Subsection (d) of section 507 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the subsection and inserting a comma and the following: "except that employees or agencies responsible for administering this act in each county shall be selected and designated by the Corporation and shall be responsible directly to the Corporation without the intervention of any intermediate office or agency."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend the Crop Insurance Act and to reduce the program to an experimental basis. My time is limited and I do not care to go into an extended discussion of the present crop-insurance program and the manner in which it has functioned. There has been much criticism of it, it has been badly administered, and there are certain features of the act which I think have made it impossible for it to function as a business proposition. I think everyone who has studied the matter, however, will agree that it is very important to the farmers of this country to give them crop insurance if a system of that kind can be worked out on a business basis. The farmer today is the only businessman who has no opportunity to carry insurance on his business operations.

The committee in reporting the present bill has not only reduced the scope of the coverage by providing that it shall be applicable only to certain crops and to a small number of counties on an experimental basis, but it has also amended the law in a number of particulars in such a way as to make Government crop insurance a businesslike proposition.

I think that if I were to name the principal thing which has made crop insurance a failure in the past I would say it was that the law we had before did not eliminate the moral risk. You cannot have any kind of an insurance program and have it operate successfully if it is more profitable to have a loss than it is not to have a loss. The way the crop-insurance program was set up and the way it has been administered in the past it was on many occasions more profitable to have a loss. That accounts, in my opinion, very largely for the failure of the present program. In this bill we have gotten away from that situation by providing that at no time shall a man's right to insurance exceed his investment in the crop. That does away, I think, with one of the principal causes of the difficulties that we have had in the past in connection with crop insurance.

In addition to that, we have changed the provision of the act which states the purpose so as to put it upon a more businesslike basis. In the original Crop Insurance Act, the language read as follows:

It is the purpose of this title to promote the national welfare by alleviating the economic distress caused by crop failure due to drought and other causes by maintaining the purchasing power of farmers and by providing for staple supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic consumption and the orderly flow thereof in interstate commerce.

That was interpreted and perhaps fairly interpreted by those administering the crop-insurance program as constituting a sort of relief program. That is the way it has been administered during most of the time that it has been in effect. The committee has substituted for that statement of purpose the following language:

It is the purpose of this title to promote the national welfare by improving the economic stability of agriculture through a sound system of crop insurance and providing the means for the research and experience helpful in devising and establishing such insurance.

If I had more time I could point out to you many ways in which the bill has been amended so as to provide for a businesslike administration of this program.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. What crops does this bill cover?

Mr. HOPE. This bill will cover to begin with, wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, and flax.

Mr. CHELF. Has not your experience been that tobacco has carried its own weight?

Mr. HOPE. Tobacco has been in the experimental program. It has carried its own weight, as the gentleman says. In fact, all the experimental programs that have been tried have not resulted over-all in any losses.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman say what year this covers?

Mr. HOPE. It will go into effect for the crop year 1948.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What do you mean that every one of these crops have carried themselves without loss?

Mr. HOPE. I meant that the premiums collected were sufficient to pay the losses.

Mr. RICH. And carry on the business and keep the capital stock?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 18 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to report to the House very briefly today on the progress of the special committee on publicity and propaganda in the executive agencies, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

Our work has been moving along for 3 months. We have published two interim reports on particular phases of Government propaganda activities—one on the operations of the Public Health Service and the Social Security Board in

behalf of socialized medicine in the United States; the other on the activities of the War Department in advocacy of universal military training. I present today only a summary of our work to date, and to acquaint the Members with some of our plans, as now outlined, for the investigations which are to be pressed during the recess.

Over a period of years there has been evident to the Members of this body a growing and sometimes disturbing tendency in the executive branch, to discount or discredit the Members and the legislative actions of the Congress of the United States. It has long been felt by some of us that this unwholesome development was not spontaneous with the people themselves, but grew out of an ever-increasing tendency on the part of the Federal agencies, with their tentacles reaching into practically every county and hamlet, to misuse the funds which have been appropriated to them, to propagandize the people to bring pressure upon Congress for the passage of specialized legislation to perpetuate jobs and ideologies.

Mr. Speaker, I have called attention of the House before, that during the New Deal there was built up in the Federal agencies the highest-priced publicity staff in the world. I said recently it was estimated this Federal publicity organization cost the taxpayers $75,000,000 a year. Today, I want to tell you, on the basis of investigations by the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda, that $75,000,000 will not approximate the amount being spent for publicity and propaganda by the Federal Government. No one can tell how high the figure goes. No one can tell—for the simple reason that practically every person on the Federal pay roll seems to consider himself an authorized lobbyist—authorized to lobby on Government time—that means the taxpayer's money—for the particular project in which he is interested.

Some of the Federal employees who have been identified in their use of Government time and materials and the Government franking privilege to influence legislation, have indicated surprise that anyone would think they were doing anything wrong. In fact, some of them seemed to conceive it their job to stir up the people with their one-sided propaganda activities, to mislead the people in an effort to get their projects approved by Congress.

One of the most insidious aspects of this type of activity is that when these people go out or write out, propagandizing the people, they presume to speak as Federal officials with the authority of the Federal Government back of them.

Here is the Federal Government speaking against the Federal Congress, or rather—and here is where the propaganda machine is very clever indeed—against an individual or individuals in Congress.

For too many years now the Federal agencies have been led to regard Congress as a rubber stamp to do their every bidding; as a whipping boy to be pounced upon by its publicists and its organized propaganda campaigns, whenever Congress elects to exercise its appointed legislative functions.

Mr. Speaker, that sort of activity must stop.

Because of obvious and flagrant abuses the House of Representatives on May 1 established the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda to investigate such activities on the part of the Federal agencies and their employees.

Although this committee has a very small staff and has been operating only a very short time, it has revealed some shocking things. And preliminary investigations already under way indicate even more shocking disclosures to come.

A major exposure of this committee was the activities of several Federal agencies in attempting to bring pressure upon Congress for the approval of socialized medicine.

The committee found that employees of six agencies arranged a series of so-called health workshop meetings, at which the Federal employees posed as Federal consultants to give the delegates factual information on health questions which might arise at the meetings. Actually, the evidence revealed, the sole purpose of the Federal employees in arranging and attending these meetings was to influence the delegates in favor of socialized medicine.

The manner in which the War Department has been attempting to sell universal military training to the people of this country has also come under consideration by the committee. The committee found that civilians were employed by the Secretary of War for the primary purpose of selling important groups on compulsory military training. In testimony before the committee the Assistant Secretary of War, Howard C. Peterson, testified that the purpose of employing these civilians was "to sell the program to the public, with the hope that the public will sell it to the Congress."

Your subcommittee has received a number of complaints with respect to the activities of county AAA committeemen in propagandizing against reductions in appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

In Nebraska, for example, the campaign appears to have been organized and conducted from the State headquarters level, where a form letter was drafted in a meeting of key officials as "suggested material" for the county committeemen. This suggested material was then carried to the county men by the farmer field men in the State.

Evidence at hand indicates the result was a flood of the most brazen propaganda to farm cooperators throughout the State.

After detailing the cuts, a typical letter states:

> If this action is sustained by the Senate when they vote on this measure in the near future, it will mean that you as well as all other farmers owning or operating land cannot be paid the full amount of money appearing on the farm plan you may have signed in which you indicated practices to be performed during 1947.
>
> The price-support program will, of course, be curtailed if money for that purpose is not made available, as well as the much-needed soil-erosion control, weed eradication, and farm drainage, the need of which the recent heavy rains have reminded us all very vividly.
>
> The recent congressional action not only affects the immediate status of agriculture, but may eventually result in economic disaster of agriculture and the Nation in the years ahead.

I want to repeat that. Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker—listen to what these people on the Federal pay roll, using Government time and materials, and using the Government frank to send out their propaganda—listen to what they have to say about the attempt of your Appropriations Committee to shave a little money from the Department of Agriculture. I quote again:

> The recent congressional action not only affects the immediate status of agriculture but may eventually result in economic disaster of agriculture and the Nation in the years ahead.

Does anyone wonder if Congress has slipped in the estimation of the public when the public receives such statements as that from Federal officials, going out under the Government frank under the guise of official Government business.

But that isn't all. That is by no means all. In fact, it gets worse as it goes on. Listen to this, and I continue to quote:

> If price stabilization is denied farmers and no provision is made to protect the land against the damages caused by the elements, history will repeat itself and economic disaster can be the only final result to farmers, business, and labor. Big capitalists and speculators who have inside and advance information may profit by depressions.

Gentlemen, I assure you neither this body nor the Department of Agriculture has heard the last of that. I have told you some of the things our preliminary investigation has revealed. We do not intend to drop it there.

In addition to these investigations, others are under way which I will not mention at this time but which you will hear more about from time to time as our work moves on.

However, I do want to say that our entire committee staff has been instructed to keep a close watch on the propaganda of the State Department in favor of the so-called Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of Europe. We have been advised on good authority that the Department has a well-organized plan to "sell" the Marshall plan to the people during the congressional recess. It is the conception of the State Department at this moment that both the Congress and the public must be educated to a fuller appreciation of what is involved in the Marshall plan. We all agree, of course, that the people are entitled to full knowledge of the Government's foreign policy. But we insist nevertheless that it is not the duty of the Department of State, nor any other executive agency, to tell the people what they ought to think on these grave matters. That's the essential difference between government publicity and Government propaganda. Enlightenment is a proper function; compelling propaganda, such as uses the devices of radio and motion pictures, leaflets, bulletins, pamphlets, and such, is not only disapproved by the conscience of representative government but is positively unlawful.

It has become apparent to your committee that Government propaganda is designed, in most instances, to make the

individual believe he is thinking for himself. In reality, Government propaganda distorts facts, with such authority that the person becomes prejudiced or biased in the direction which the Government propagandists wish to lead national thinking. It is the authority and the supposed objectivity of Government which leads people to accept, without question, the words released by Government officials and agencies. Propaganda in its crudest form appeals to emotion only. Government propaganda is frequently only slanted, but accomplishes the same result. An individual might be wary and critical of material coming from a special interest group. He knows such groups have an ax to grind, but he will consider as gospel truth, if the Government says the identical thing, because he thinks Government officials are impartial.

I have told this body before that in 1 week we measured the total output of the Federal publicity bureaus. The volume of material made about 800 columns of newsprint—more than might have been printed in the average daily paper in 1 week if nothing had been allowed for advertising, cartoons, and editorials.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have a representative form of government with the Congress making the laws, this sort of thing must be stopped. Otherwise, the Congress will become in truth a rubber stamp to carry out the whims and vagaries of the undercover propagandists in the Federal agencies.

I for one do not propose to see that happen. Your committee does not propose to see that happen. And I pledge you here and now that the Committee on Publicity and Propaganda will continue its efforts to expose this sort of thing wherever it exists, regardless of the agencies or personalities involved.

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

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Who was the author of the communication the gentleman has just quoted from?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I have not the letter with me. I have it in my office.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman stated it was a Government official.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. If that is true, the letter indicates that there might be a violation of existing law. My recollection is we have a law which makes it unlawful for a Government official or for a person on the Government pay roll to use the services and the time of the Government in propaganda activities.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes. That is section 201, title XVIII, of the Criminal Code.

Mr. COOLEY. I am wondering if the gentleman may not be mistaken and if that might not have originated with some farm organization.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No. That originated in the agricultural office in the State of Nebraska. The committee sent an investigator out there who personally investigated and brought back the facts.

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

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has made reefrence to certain letters that were sent around the State of Nebraska. In all fairness it should be said that no doubt there were some farmers and AAA field men who were drawn into something they did not realize was unlawful. I believe I know where those things originated. The Democratic State chairman sent out a telegram to each county containing information that was inaccurate and suggested that they start a propaganda campaign.

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are presently considering a bill to carry on Federal crop insurance on an experimental basis. Speaking wholly for myself, I should like to liquidate the program. I am not unmindful of the fact, however, it would be impossible to secure conclusive action in both sides on such a program at this time; consequently I trust that the present bill will be passed and that it can be enacted into law because it will be the only limitation we have on the crop-insurance program.

Now, in this season of the year when baseball is at its zenith you often hear men accost each other and ask "What is the score?" You will be interested in the score on crop insurance as it was disclosed to my subcommittee after extensive hearings. I divided it into two parts, the first part which began with the enactment of so-called crop insurance in June 1938, the second period beginning in 1944.

In the first period we had 5 full crop years when wheat was insured. We had 2 full years of insurance on the cotton crop. The loss on wheat was $26,312,000; the loss on cotton was $11,562,000. The administrative expense for that period was $28,000,000. So, from the first period from 1938 to 1944 the score on crop insurance was a loss to the Federal Treasury, including administrative expenses, of $66,000,000.

At that time crop insurance was liquidated partly through a modest effort of my own and then was restored in the Senate, so we started once more. We started then on wheat and cotton and in an experimental way on tobacco, flax, and corn. On the latter crops we insured some 16 counties. Here is the score for period No. 2. We make a modest profit of $6,000,000 on wheat. We took a loss of $57,000,000 on cotton. Most of that came in one single crop year because the farmers had outguessed the Crop Insurance Corporation. The administrative expense for that period was $9,000,000. The loss, therefore, was a net $60,000,000; $66,000,000 plus $60,000,000 means a loss of $126,000,000. It reminds me of the echoes that come back from the discussion on crop insurance on this floor in 1938 when it was said, "Let us try it out; let us make this venture; we are sure that a capital stock of $100,000,000 will be sufficient to carry out all of the experimental stage and put it on good grounds." I have lived in my young life to see the day when the entire corporate stock of the crop-insurance program has been liquidated, and in addition thereto there has been an expenditure of $48,000,000 for administrative expenses.

Now, there are some oddities that have developed. For instance, in five States last year the expense of writing the business exceeded all of the premiums that we got. The field expense ranged from $4.79 to $20.78 per contract. No insurance company in the world could stay in business on that basis. I give you a typical example.

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the State of Georgia the premiums were $200,000 plus and the expenses of doing business were $157,000. We cannot get crop insurance liquidated now, so I suggest to you that at least we adopt a limitation on the program, and the bill before you will place it on an experimental basis, namely, about 20 counties, for most of these crops.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, the appropriation bill contained a continuity for the experimental program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The appropriation bill contained language setting a limitation similar to that carried in the Aiken bill in the Senate.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If this bill does not become law, will the experimental program continue or will it be stopped?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; the program will continue, but on a larger scale than is contemplated in the existing bill, and that is the reason I hope that the present bill will be enacted.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It would seem that any ordinary business concern would do its experimental work first, and thereafter enlarge. We are doing it backward.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my good friend from Pennsylvania that the affairs of government are not always ordinary.

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

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Rooney.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order 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. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the action taken earlier this week by the conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill—which is now at the White House—is a signal victory for the

people of the Southwest insofar as the item for Southwestern Power Administration is concerned. The unanimous decision of the conferees guarantees that Norfork and Denison dams will be tied together as they should by a transmission line, and insures the construction of a substation to be built at Waleetka, Okla., at a cost of $500,000. Thus the people's dams will remain the properties of the people—not the properties of the private utilities and their powerful lobby.

The unexpended funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1947 are continued available during the fiscal year 1948 and whether work has been physically started before June 30, 1947, or not, are made available for the construction of necessary interconnecting facilities incident to and connected with the construction of the Denison-Norfork transmission line. Thus the competent administrator of Southwestern Power Administration, Douglas Wright, has sufficient moneys to carry on his commendable work for the people of the Southwest in the fiscal year 1948 and to cause electricity to be brought to many more of the farms of that portion of our great country.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to follow this crop-insurance program for the last 3 or 4 years. You heard the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that up until 1943 we squandered $66,280,000 on this program. At that time we had given them only $30,000,000 of capital stock. Then they asked for an appropriation for $40,000,000 more. At that time, because of the record they had made, I objected very strenuously to granting any more money to this organization. I not only fought that bill when it was on the floor of the House, but after the bill was passed I made up my mind that I would try my best as a Member of Congress to follow it through, and if possible make it successful, and stop the waste of Government funds. I wrote a letter to Marvin Jones, who was then War Food Administrator, and gave him my ideas on how that ought to be operated, and suggested he keep his eye on this organization. He replied that if it later did not prove out more satisfactorily than it had in the beginning, he would do his utmost to see that it was discontinued.

I then wrote a letter to Mr. Wright, who was then chairman of this corporation, and asked him the names of the people whom he would propose to operate it and their responsibility and experience in business. Mr. Wright gave me a reply, and also came to my office several times and discussed the Federal crop-insurance program with me. At that time he said he was having some men come from Chicago to try to assist them in making this plan work. That was in 1944.

Since that time they have lost every dollar that has been put into this program, every dollar of the capital stock, which amounted to $100,000,000. They spent over $50,000,000 in administration of the program. They made a profit of $8,000,000 on wheat and they lost that. All the premiums they received during the time crop insurance was in effect, and I do not know how many millions of dollars that was, have been lost. It continually lost, lost, lost. It is one of the most colossal instances of poor legislation and poor business I have ever known or had ever experienced. So I came to the conclusion that I would do everything I could to see that the Federal crop insurance was put out of business. I have not had any success in putting it out of business, because the Committee on Agriculture now comes in with this bill to carry insurance for crops on as an experiment. As was said a while ago, we are experimenting at the wrong end of this organization. It should have had its experimentation way back in 1939. But you are not through with this yet. It will be a great loss, I feel sure, as long as you go.

I asked the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture whether, if this experiment did not prove out successfully in 2 years, he would use his influence to close it up. He and other members of the Committee on Agriculture said if they could not make a successful venture out of it in 2 years it ought to be closed up. I hope they are going to carry that out.

This situation has been dreadfully bad. To think that we had a man in there for 3 or 4 years who squandered all this money. I went to see the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, just recently. I asked him where Mr. Wright was. He said, "He is not here now. There is somebody else who is going to have charge of this Federal crop insurance program." So I tried to find out where Mr. Wright was and I had quite a time locating him. I thought there was something wrong, so I sent for Mr. Wright. I located him down here in Alexandria. Finally, I got him in the office. I found out, but I did not find out from him, that Mr. Anderson showed him the gate and told him to get out. Well, Mr. Anderson did a good thing when he showed Mr. Wright the gate because anybody who could see a corporation run for this length of time and the great losses, ought to get the gate. Crop insurance as administered was inefficient, poor judgment, poor management, and it was not insurance but dishonest business as operated.

I hope you will vote for this resolution as bad as it is. We will have to take it and think it is a good thing just because it will stop the business as previously operated and certainly this bill will not be as bad as previously conducted. I shall vote for this improvement but if I could vote to eliminate the Federal Crop Insurance program altogether I would do so.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield the time I have to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there is anything I can add to the discussion of this legislation. Of course, I have followed it for the last 8 years. I do want to point out that there seems to be one crop that this insurance particularly applies to, and that crop is tobacco. A tobacco crop is just a little bit different from any other crop because of the fact that a man usually has only a very small acreage. His whole yearly earnings are wrapped up in half an acre, an acre, or a few acres of tobacco.

Following the reports through the years and with all the bad records that we have had here today, those statements do not apply to tobacco.

As to the others, that is water under the dam. There is no use rehashing that. We know it has been maladministered. I think everyone admits that. It is regrettable that this crop-insurance program, though started as a program ended up in the class of a racket. But I do think from the standpoint of tobacco, if we did not go any further than that, we should carry this on for at least another year or two to see if we cannot set up some yardstick so far as the tobacco insurance for tobacco is concerned.

This legislation under consideration today, if carefully administered, will determine whether national crop insurance should be a permanent policy or whether it should be discontinued once and for all.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3465 is not new legislation. It is restrictive or a limitation on the present law as it is now written.

DIFFICULTIES WITH FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Contributing to the difficulties of this first Federal experiment in crop insurance was the background against which the legislation was enacted. The Nation had just passed through the disastrous drought years. Farmers in many parts of the country were reeling under the impact of the double blows of economic and natural disaster. They desperately needed assistance. The decision to undertake the writing of crop insurance on a Nation-wide scale, instead of on a limited experimental basis such as the course of prudence would have dictated, must be regarded as partially an effort to bring relief to farmers who were in critical need of it. As such, it served its purpose—and probably did so as equitably and at as little cost to the Federal Treasury as any other method would have done. But such a purpose was not conducive to the development of an actuarially sound system of insurance.

Inherent also in that crop insurance effort was the defect of its conception as part of the ever-normal granary. The commodities received as premium payments or purchased in the hedging operation, it was believed, would add to the supplies in the granary and contribute to the stabilization of agricultural prices—this apparently without realizing fully the cost of administering and storing such supplies and the effect the accumulated surpluses themselves would have in overriding and depressing the

very market they were designed to support.

Against this background Federal crop insurance got under way with the wheat crop of 1939; and for five successive years the indemnities paid exceeded the premiums collected, despite the fact that some of the years were excellent wheat-crop years for the country as a whole. In 1942 insurance was offered on cotton, pursuant to an amendment to the act, and for 2 years losses were sustained on cotton insurance, despite two good cotton crops.

By 1943 agriculture was well into the era of high wartime prices, emergency relief measures were no longer necessary, and crop insurance was terminated with the 1943 crop. The losses on wheat had total $26,312,000; on cotton, $11,480,000, plus an administrative expenditure of $28,488,000.

THE REINSTATED PROGRAM

There was still, however, the almost universal feeling that farmers are entitled to the stability resulting from insurance of their crops against losses from causes beyond their control, if such insurance could be developed on a sound basis—and that the brief period of semi-insurance, semi-relief activity from 1939 to 1943 had not given the program a fair trial. Accordingly, the decision to abandon the effort to develop crop insurance was reconsidered, and in December 1944 Congress reinstated the program. Some refinements and adjustments were made, in the light of the previous experience; but, on the whole, the scope of the wheat and cotton programs were not changed, and flax was added as a commodity on which general insurance was to be offered. Corn and tobacco were included but limited to 20 representative counties for each community. The results of this second phase of operations is shown in the following table:

Crop insurance—gain or loss from insurance operation, crop years 1945 and 1946

	1945	1946 [1]
Wheat	+$828,552.73	+$5,446,536.71
Cotton	−15,243,622.30	−41,620,044.02
Flax	+574,191.57	−566,240.25
Corn:		
Yield	−284,991.86	−6,149.00
Investment	+24,801.29	+47,599.24
Tobacco	+148,949.02	+568,700.00

[1] Estimated.

NOTE.—Plus (+) indicates gain; minus (−) indicates loss.

With the exception of cotton, the results in terms of gain or loss during the past 2 years have not been too unsatisfactory. The losses on cotton, however, are not such as can be countenanced in a sound insurance program, and there is no present assurance that a similar situation will not develop with regard to wheat if the current cycle of exceptionally favorable wheat years should suddenly end. To put it briefly, the committee believes that the present crop-insurance program is, on the whole, neither sound insurance nor profitable experimentation.

DEVELOPMENT A LONG-TIME PROJECT

The committee believes it should be recognized that the development of a sound crop-insurance program covering even the major agricultural commodities on a Nation-wide basis is a long-time project that may well take years in its accomplishment. It has taken many years, the experience and intelligence of many individuals, and the investment and loss of millions of dollars to develop other forms of casualty insurance to the sound position they now occupy. In the course of that development, hundreds of insurance companies were formed and went bankrupt, hundreds of types of insurance were tried and found wanting, and millions of individual investors and policy holders ventured and lost their own money in the trial and error experiments which eventually contributed to the welfare of the Nation as a whole. In crop insurance, at least, those who could least afford it—the policyholders who thought they had purchased protection—have not been required to foot the whole bill for the national experiment.

If crop insurance is to succeed in the United States, it must fulfill two basic requirements: First, it must be sound from a business standpoint—capable of "paying its own way" and operating without loss to the Government; second, it must offer farmers a type of insurance they want and are willing and able to pay for.

FARMERS ENTITLED TO EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

The committee believes that it is possible eventually to write crop insurance that will meet both these basic qualifications. It does not believe that this can be accomplished overnight nor that it is reasonable to expect that a half-dozen crop seasons of experience will achieve for crop insurance what it took other forms of commodity insurance many years of trial and error to develop. The committee is convinced, however, that the best interests of farmers themselves will be most truly served if the Public Treasury is protected against excessive loss, by curtailment of the insurance program during its development period to the smallest scale consistent with effective experimentation, and expanding it later only when experience has indicated that a sound insurance plan has been worked out.

The committee has, therefore, prepared this bill, H. R. 3465, placing the crop-insurance program on a strictly experimental basis and providing the Crop Insurance Corporation with the latitude of operation and the authority which it believes to be necessary to the carrying out of a truly experimental program. The details of the proposed program are explained in the analysis of the bill.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that much can be gained by trying to place responsibility for the losses on crop insurance in the past. I think an investigation would disclose that there are many different sources to blame.

I do want to express the hope that some way can be found to bring some degree of security to those people who provide the food and fiber to feed and clothe the Nation. I have said before and I would like to repeat now that it seems to me the people who work in the field, who work in the sun and produce the food to feed the remainder of the Nation are entitled to that same degree of security and protection as is now enjoyed by the people who eat that food. Is that not fundamental?

I hope that some way can be found out of this experiment whereby we can bring to the people on the farms some protection against the hazards they must bear today. I think that the pending bill will greatly improve the program.

I would like to refer briefly to some of the measures provided in this bill which should save the Government the enormous losses which have been mentioned here.

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

Mr. PACE. I yield briefly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to make this observation. The gentleman from Georgia now addressing us, as well as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, have both been energetic in taking every step for the welfare of the people who live and work on our farms.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. In regard to cotton insurance, does that extend to all varieties of cotton, long fiber as well as short?

Mr. PACE. It extends to all varieties and in all areas. When the experimental program is put into operation, the purpose will be to select a county here and a county there which, when selected, will be completely representative of the production of cotton throughout the Nation.

I would like to state some of the changes which are being made and which I think will prevent future losses.

This bill limits the farmer's recovery under his policy to not exceeding his investment. So no more can there be the possibility of a producer abandoning his crop and trying to make a profit on his insurance.

Secondly, it eliminates insurance in any county where there are not at least 200 farms, or one-third of the farmers under the program. This should eliminate a great deal of expense.

Third, and very important, for the first time we give the Board the right to refuse to write farmers on the basis of risk. Heretofore the Corporation was required to insure a crop regardless of the reputation, the background, or the moral risk of the farmer. The Corporation states that this has contributed in good measure to its losses.

Fourth, and I think this is equally important, this bill gives the Corporation the right to hire and fire and direct its own employees. I know many of you will be surprised to learn that up to this time the Corporation did the insuring but another agency of the Department of Agriculture provided all of the employees to administer the program out in the field. The consequence has been to have a business organization trying to put the program on a business basis but with no authority to select its employees.

Lastly, and also important, heretofore and hereafter all premiums may be paid in the commodity; that is, if you insure a wheat crop, you can pay your premium in wheat. But to save itself from heavy

losses due to changes in price the Corporation has been required to buy an amount of wheat equal to the premiums and keep it in storage. This has been very expensive. Under this bill the Corporation is authorized to establish premiums on the basis of the parity or comparable price for the commodity insured, or on the basis of an average market price, and then to determine indemnities on the same price basis as the premiums are determined. This should result in great savings and greatly improve the program.

I ask your approval of this bill, and I sincerely hope that through these experimental programs we can find sound means and methods of soon setting up a Nation-wide, all-commodity insurance program for the protection of our agricultural producers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish that this bill had been brought before the House under a rule which would enable more time for debate. This matter is an important one. The farmers of America are interested in Federal Crop Insurance. The bill contains necessary amendments to the Federal Crop Insurance Act. I think these amendments will revitalize the program and will enable a greater number of farmers of America to participate in this Federal crop insurance program.

For many years, almost every member of the economic family of the Nation, has been able to insure against accidental loss of the commodity he deals with, except the farmer. The idea of protecting the farmer against accidental loss or destruction of his products is a sound one. The law with these amendments will, I believe, be put on a sound basis. Insurance generally is comparatively new, but it has been fully applied to the protection of every commodity except the crops grown by farmers. Many years ago, efforts were made to provide crop insurance but the first real effort came in the act of February 1938. However, the program has been carried out on a hit and miss basis and it has never had the backing from Congress it deserves.

This bill undertakes to place the act on a sound basis which will eventually pay its own way without loss to the Government and it proposes to offer farmers a type of insurance which they want and which they are willing to pay for. I think the Committee on Agriculture has done a splendid service to the farmers of the Nation in reporting this measure and I hope that it may be passed through both Houses of Congress during this session.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

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.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its amendment and request a conference with the Senate and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, HILL, FLANNAGAN, and COOLEY.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the special orders heretofore granted.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

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

There was no objection.

MARINE BAND AUTHORIZED TO ATTEND THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AT NEW YORK AND THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES IN CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4247) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 1633) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national convention of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., August 28 to 31, 1947, and the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, September 4 to 9, 1947, may be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and perform in the parade of the American Legion to be held in New York, N. Y., on August 30, 1947, and to attend and perform in the parade of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in Cleveland, Ohio, on a date between September 4 to 9, 1947, to be selected by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of such band in attending and performing in such parades, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to cover the cost of transportation and pullman accommodations for the leaders and members of the Marine Band, and allowance not to exceed $6 per day each for additional traveling and living expenses while on duty, such allowances to be in addition to the pay and allowance to which they would be entitled while serving their permanent station.

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

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 4247) were laid on the table.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION; CANCELLATION OF CAPITAL STOCK AND REFUND OF MONEYS RECEIVED FOR SUCH STOCK

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1070) to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is directed to retire its capital stock by paying the amount received therefor (whether received from the Secretary of the Treasury or the Federal Reserve banks) to the Secretary of the Treasury as hereinafter provided, to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, the Corporation shall pay to the Secretary so much of its capital and surplus as is in excess of $1,000,000,000. The balance of the amount to be paid to the Secretary shall be paid in units of $10,000,000 except that the last unit to be paid may be less than $10,000,000. Each unit shall be paid as soon as it may be paid without reducing the capital and surplus of the Corporation below $1,000,000,000. As each payment is made a corresponding amount of the capital stock of the Corporation shall be retired and canceled and the receipt or certificate therefor shall be surrendered or endorsed to show such cancellation. The stock subscribed by the various Federal Reserve banks shall be retired and canceled, pro rata, before the stock subscribed by the Secretary is retired and canceled.

SEC. 2. Section 12B (d) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (d)), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 12B (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (b)), is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000."

SEC. 4. Section 12B (o) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (o)), is amended to read as follows:

"(o) The Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to loan to the Corporation on such terms as may be fixed by the Corporation and the Secretary, such funds as in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Corporation are from time to time required for insurance purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate $3,000,000,000. For such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include such loans. Any such loan shall be used by the Corporation solely in carrying out its functions with respect to such insurance. All loans and repayments under this section shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States."

SEC. 5. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 5c of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 606a (b) and (c)), are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 20, strike out "$12,500" and insert "$15,000."

Page 3, line 7, after the figures "$3,000,000" insert "outstanding at any one time: *Provided*, That the rate of interest to be charged in connection with any loan made pursuant to this paragraph shall not be less than the current average rate on outstanding marketable and nonmarketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of such loan."

Page 3, strike out lines 23 and 24, and on page 4, strike out all of lines 1 and 2.

The amendments were agreed to.

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.

REGIONAL DISBURSING OFFICERS, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 907) to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death or of the resignation or separation from office of the Chief Disbursing Officer," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1086; U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 5, sec. 249b), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That in case of the death or of the resignation or separation from office of the Chief Disbursing Officer or any regional disbursing officer of the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, the accounts of such Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer may be continued and payments made in his name by an Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer designated by the Secretary of the Treasury or by an assistant regional disbursing officer designated by the Secretary of the Treasury or designated by an official of the Treasury Department authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury to make such designated, for a period of time not to extend beyond the last day of the second month following the month in which such death, resignation, or separation shall occur. Such accounts and payments shall be allowed, audited, and settled in the General Accounting Office, and the checks signed in the name of the former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer shall be honored by the Treasurer of the United States, in the same manner as if the former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer had continued in office. The former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer, his estate, or the surety on his official bond, shall not be subject to any legal liability or penalty for the official acts and defaults of the Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer or assistant regional disbursing officer acting in the name or in the place of the former Chief Disbursing Officer or regional disbursing officer under this act, but the Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer or the assistant regional disbursing officer, and his surety, shall be responsible therefor under his bond. The bond of the Acting Chief Disbursing Officer or acting regional disbursing officer shall be an amount at least equal to the minimum amount of the bond required of the Chief Disbursing Officer or the regional disbursing officer, respectively. The Secretary of the Treasury may, from time to time, require the Assistant Chief Disbursing Officer, or the assistant regional disbursing officer, to renew and increase his bond to the United States."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, strike out the word "designated" and insert the word "designation."

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4168) to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, as of the date of enactment of this act, created as an agency of the United States of America a body corporate with the name of "The Institute of Inter-American Affairs" (in this act called the "Institute").

SEC. 2. The purposes of this corporation are to further the general welfare of, and to strengthen friendship and understanding among, the peoples of the American Republics through collaboration with other governments and governmental agencies of the American Republics in planning, initiating, assisting, financing, administering, and executing technical programs and projects, especially in the fields of public health, sanitation, agriculture, and education.

SEC. 3. The Institute, as a corporation—

(a) Shall have succession for a period of 5 years unless sooner dissolved by an act of Congress.

(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) May make and perform contracts with any individual, corporation, or other body of persons however designated, whether within or without the United States of America, and with any government or governmental agency, domestic or foreign.

(d) Shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid.

(e) May, as necessary for the transaction of the business of the Institute, employ officers, employees, agents, and attorneys in accordance with the provisions of the civil service and classification laws, except that the Institute may, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, employ, and fix the compensation of, officers, employees, agents, and attorneys of the Institute employed for service outside the continental limits of the United States: *Provided*, That the salary of any person thus employed shall not exceed the maximum salary established by the classification laws, and that the Institute may require bonds of any employee and pay the premiums of such bonds: *Provided further*, That no person who is a citizen of the United States not presently employed by the Institute of Inter-American affairs or the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., shall be employed under authority of this paragraph (e) until such person has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation: *Provided further*, That no person not a citizen of the United States shall be employed under authority of this paragraph (e) for service in any Amerian Republic of which such person is not a citizen except with the specific approval of the Government of the American Republic concerned.

(f) May acquire by purchase, devise, bequest, or gift, or otherwise, lease, hold, and improve such real and personal property as it finds to be necessary to its purposes, whether within or without the United States, and in any manner dispose of all such real and personal property held by it and use as general funds all receipts arising from the disposition of such property.

(g) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and on the same conditions as the executive departments of the Government.

(h) May, with the consent of any board, corporation, commission, independent establishment, or executive department of the Government, including any field service thereof, avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(i) May accept money, funds property, and services of every kind by gift, devise or bequest, or grant, or otherwise, and make advances and grants to any individual, corporation, or other body of persons, whether within or without the United States of America, or to any government or governmental agency, domestic or foreign, when deemed advisable by the Institute in furtherance of its purposes.

(j) May sue and be sued, complain, and defend, in its corporate name in any court of competent jurisdiction.

(k) Shall have such other powers as may be necessary and incident to carrying out its powers and duties under this act.

SEC. 4. Upon termination of the corporate life of the Institute all of its functions shall be liquidated and, thereafter, unless otherwise provided by Congress, the assets shall be transferred to the United States Treasury as the property of the United States.

SEC. 5. (a) The management of the Institute shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") of not less than five in number, each of whom shall be appointed by the Secretary of State from among the officials and employees of the Department of State and, in the discretion of the Secretary of State and with the consent of the chiefs of other departments or agencies respectively concerned from among the officials and employees of other United States Government departments and agen-

cies: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed as a director under authority of this paragraph (a) until such person has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b) The Secretary of State shall designate one director as Chairman of the Board.

(c) The directors shall hold office at the pleasure of the Secretary of State.

(d) The directors shall receive no additional compensation for their services as directors but may be allowed actual necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as directors.

(e) The Board shall direct the exercise of all the powers of the Institute.

(f) The Board may prescribe, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which the business of the Institute may be conducted and in which the powers granted to it by law may be exercised and enjoyed: *Provided*, That a majority of the Board shall be required as a quorum.

(g) In furtherance and not in limitation of the powers conferred upon it, the Board may appoint such committees for the carrying out of the work of the Institute as the Board finds to be for the best interests of the Institute, each committee to consist of two or more of the directors, which committees, together with officers and agents duly authorized by the Board and to the extent provided by the Board, shall have and may exercise the powers of the Board in the management of the business and affairs of the Institute.

SEC. 6. The Institute shall be a nonprofit corporation and shall have no capital stock. No part of its revenue, earnings, or other income or property shall inure to the benefit of its directors, officers, and employees and such revenue, earnings, or other income, or property shall be used for the carrying out of the corporate purposes herein set forth. No director, officer, or employee of the corporation shall in any manner directly or indirectly participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or organization in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

SEC. 7. When approved by the Institute, in furtherance of its purposes, the officers and employees of the Institute may accept and hold offices or positions to which no compensation is attached with governments or governmental agencies of the other American Republics.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of State shall have authority to detail employees of the Department of State to the Institute under such circumstances and upon such conditions as he may determine: *Provided*, That any such employee so detailed shall not lose any privileges, rights, or seniority as an employee of the Government by virtue of such detail.

SEC. 9. The principal office of the Institute shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies, branch offices, or other offices in any place or places within the United States or the other American Republics in any of which locations the Institute may carry on all or any of its operations and business under bylaws or rules and regulations.

SEC. 10. The Institute, including its franchise and income, shall be exempt from taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, or any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

SEC. 11. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved. If any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act shall for any reason be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act, but shall be confined in its operations to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

SEC. 12. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs and the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., two Government corporations caused to be created under the laws of the State of Delaware on March 31, 1942, and September 25, 1943, respectively, by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, shall, within 10 days following the enactment of this act, transfer to the corporation created by this act all necessary personnel, the assets, funds, and property—real, personal, and mixed—and all debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties, and all right, privileges, and powers subject to all restrictions, disabilities, and duties of the two said corporations, and the corporation created by this act, shall accept full title to and ownership of all the assets, funds, and property—real, personal, and mixed—and all debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties, and all rights, privileges, and powers subject to the said restrictions, disabilities, and duties of the two said corporations and all such debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties of the two said corporations shall henceforth attach to the corporation created by this act and may be enforced against it to the same extent as if said debts, liabilities, obligations, and duties had been incurred or contracted by the corporation created by this act: *Provided*, That all citizens of the United States presently employed by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs or the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., and transferred under authority of this section 12 to the corporation created by this act shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation within 6 months following the date of enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That no person not a citizen of the United States presently employed by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs or the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., for service in an American Republic of which such person is not a citizen, and transferred under authority of this section 12, shall be retained in such service for a period exceeding three months from the date of enactment of this act except with the specific approval of the government of the American Republic concerned.

SEC. 13. The Institute shall be subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Cong.).

SEC. 14. There are authorized to be appropriated, at a rate not to exceed $5,000,000 annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

This act may be cited as the "Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what his understanding is as to the intent on the part of the State Department for these Inter-American corporations? When this bill came up on the Consent Calendar the other day I requested another Member to ask that it be passed over, which was done.

In the Appropriations Committee it is our general understanding that these activities are to be liquidated as of June 30, 1948, which leads me to believe there is little reason for the extension of these corporations. The gentleman's bill attempts to give them 5 years new life. He has agreed to 3 years instead of 5. But I would like it to be explicitly understood that there is not to be any initiation of new contracts, programs, involving commitment of this Government beyond the present commitments on the part of the United States.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman means beyond June 30, 1948?

Mr. PLOESER. I have not any objection to the period of liquidation or even an additional supervisory period. But this attempt amounts to committing us to new programs. All of these programs have an expiration date prior to June 30, 1948.

Mr. JONKMAN. This is a Government-owned corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware. In December 1945, the Government passed the Government Corporation Decontrol Act which provided that after June 30, 1948 all of these corporations incorporated under State law should cease to operate as agencies of the United States. That is the statute that is affecting the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. It is not the action of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PLOESER. Of course, that is not the question. The question is, do they intend to institute any new programs beyond those which they are now completing?

Mr. JONKMAN. My understanding is that they do not intend to institute any programs after 1948. There may be minor ones within the period through 1948.

Mr. PLOESER. They testified before us that these programs are expiring and a liquidation period as far as financial assistance beyond 1948 is concerned is not needed, that in the main it may take some time into the fiscal year 1949 to wipe out all of the commitments we have as of the present day. This looks like a chance for the camel to get its nose under the tent and make new commitments for additional programs.

Mr. JONKMAN. Some of these programs take 2, 3, 4, or 5 years. There are some that are not completed and will not be completed perhaps by June 30, 1948.

Mr. PLOESER. It is not the gentleman's intention that they initiate any new programs?

Mr. JONKMAN. It is my understanding they will not.

Mr. PLOESER. That is the gentleman's intention. The gentleman's intention and my intention is that they shall not.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is my understanding.

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

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: Page 2, line 5, after the word "of", strike out "five" and insert "three."

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.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS IN BOISE, IDAHO

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1505) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what kind of land is this?

Mr. GOFF. It is some lots that the Chamber of Commerce of Boise conveyed to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of building an office for the Forest Service. The lots were not used for that purpose. The building was not constructed, and now this bill seeks to reconvey the lots to the Boise Chamber of Commerce. They were conveyed to the Federal Government for the sum of $1. The bill has passed the Senate.

Mr. RICH. Will the chamber of commerce give the $1 back?

Mr. GOFF. Yes. It provides that they shall pay the same price as the Government paid for it.

Mr. RICH. I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the Boise Chamber of Commerce, Boise, Idaho, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to lots one to nine, inclusive, in block two of Riverside Park addition to Boise City, Ada County, Idaho.

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.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL PERMANENT MAJOR GENERALS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2993) to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint as permanent major generals of the line of the Regular Army the following officers of the Regular Army serving in the temporary grade of major general in the Army of the United States: Edward P. King, Jr.; William F. Sharp; George F. Moore; George M. Parker, Jr.; and Albert M. Jones.

SEC. 2. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army the following officers of the Regular Army serving in the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Army of the United States: Clifford Bluemel, James R. N. Weaver, Maxon S. Lough, William E. Brougher, Joseph P. Vachon, Charles C. Drake, Bradford G. Chynoweth, Clinton A. Pierce, Arnold J. Funk, Lewis C. Beebe, and Kearie L. Berry.

SEC. 3. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint Luther R. Stevens, an officer of the Philippine Constabulary, serving as a temporary brigadier general in the Philippine Army, as a permanent brigadier general of the line of the Regular Army.

SEC. 4. Effective as of the date of his relief from active duty, Carl H. Seals, a retired officer of the Regular Army serving on active duty as a temporary brigadier general in the Army of the United States, shall be advanced on the retired list of the Regular Army to the grade of brigadier general, and shall receive the retired pay provided by law for officers retired in that grade.

SEC. 5. Any persons appointed pursuant to the provisions of section 1, 2, or 3 of this act shall be additional general officers of the line of the Regular Army in the grades to which so appointed and shall not be counted for the purposes of provisions of law establishing the authorized number of general officers of the line of the Regular Army. Nothing in this act shall be deemed permanently to increase the authorized number of general officers of the line of the Regular Army or to authorize the appointment in the grade of general officer of the line of any successor to any such person.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. D'EWART: On page 2, line 9, strike out the word "and" after the first comma, and before the period, insert the words "and William P. Morse."

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.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION UPON THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S 609) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims arising out of the deaths of Normal Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims against the United States arising out of the deaths of Normal Ray Pedron and Carl Franklin Morris, late of Hope, Ark., who were killed April 15, 1944, at Hope, Ark., by the explosion of a 37-millimeter shell of the type used by the United States Army.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claims the United States shall be held liable for damages and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "twentieth" of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

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.

HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2389, an act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JENNINGS, SPRINGER, and KEAN.

A. E. McCARTNEY ET AL.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 629) entitled "An act for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; P. W. Woodyard and J. R. Mahon; B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. B. Lacy; G. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox; W. W. Cox and Dr. J. W. Cox; Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart," do pass with the following Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "$3,688.69", insert "the sum of $930.75 to Joseph Natali, Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., and Farmers' Land & Canal Co., and the sum of $1,004.06 to J. E. Fournier, Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., and Farmers' Land & Canal Co."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of A. E. McCartney and others."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, 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 amendment numbered 36.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 26, 27, 28, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,388,266,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,469,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In

lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,549,755,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,170,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$154,032,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$83,299,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$699,646,960"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$374,055,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$82,474,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$829,272,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$430,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$69,534,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$129,386,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$191,353,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$320,739,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$245,532,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,890,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$134,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$67,828,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$43,039,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 16, 19, 21, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, and 92.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
STYLES BRIDGES,
ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
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 Senate to the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $2,388,286,700 for "Pay of the Army" instead of $2,348,438,179 as proposed by the House and $2,423,813,129 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $21,469,000 for "Finance service, Finance Department," instead of $20,160,650 as proposed by the House and $22,806,563, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Corrects total for the "Finance Service, Army."

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $7,170,500 for "Welfare of enlisted men, Quartermaster Corps," instead of $6,777,141 as proposed by the House and $7,610,619 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $78,559,860 for "Regular supplies of the Army" as proposed by the Senate instead of $70,059,860 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $154,032,900 for "Clothing and equipage" instead of $153,834,336 as proposed by the House and $154,330,688 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $83,299,300 for "Incidental expenses of the Army" instead of $78,530,058 as proposed by the House and $88,430,042 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Corrects total for the "Quartermaster Service, Army."

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $374,055,100 for "Transportation service, Army," instead of $347,577,227 as proposed by the House and $392,633,443 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $82,474,900 for "Signal Service, Army," instead of $79,128,895 as proposed by the House and $85,475,501 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $829,272,100 for the "Air Corps, Army," instead of $773,332,508 as proposed by the House and $858,443,591 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Authorizes contract authorization of $430,000,000 for "Air Corps, Army," instead of $280,000,000 as proposed by the House and $497,490,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $69,534,000 for the "Medical and Hospital Department" instead of $69,153,267 as proposed by the House and $70,049,458 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $129,386,000 for "Engineer Service, Army," instead of $114,512,405 as proposed by the House and $145,456,441 as proposed by the Senate. The $10,800,000 recommended by the Senate for requirements due to the new policy of treating as liberated nations certain countries heretofore treated as occupied is not included in the approved amount. This action by the conferees is not intended to prevent a request for a deficiency for this purpose later in the year upon proper justifications.

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $191,353,000 for "Barracks and quarters, Army," instead of $184,702,101 as proposed by the House and $197,896,261 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Corrects a total for "Engineer Service, Army."

Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $245,532,800 for "Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army," instead of $244,381,771 as proposed by the House and $247,024,041 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $19,890,300 for "Chemical Service, Army," instead of $19,240,936 as proposed by the House and $20,487,813 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $134,000,000 for the "National Guard" instead of $110,000,000 as proposed by the House and $136,535,176 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $67,828,900 for the "Organized Reserves" instead of $54,975,816 as proposed by the House and $80,681,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $25,025,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $24,840,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27: Increases the limitation on "Clerical services" to $82,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $60,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $303,500 for the "Promotion of rifle practice," as proposed by the Senate instead of $281,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Adjusts the funds to be transferred by the Secretary of War for employment of additional personnel at the

seat of government and elsewhere to $43,039,100.

Amendments Nos. 30 to 35, inclusive: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 36: Eliminates the provision proposed by the Senate authorizing the transfer of not to exceed 5 percent between appropriations.

TITLE II—SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSIONS

Amendments Nos. 37 to 92, inclusive: Reported in disagreement.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 11, pertaining to contract authorization for the "Signal Service of the Army." The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting such authorization to $5,000,000 instead of $11,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16, pertaining to contract authorization "Engineer Service, Army." The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting such authorization to $2,000,000 instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19. Eliminates the House language pertaining to the sale of scrap or salvage material under "Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army," and substitutes therefor clarifying language as follows:

"*Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, not more than $25,000,000 of the amounts received by the War Department during the fiscal year 1948 as proceeds from the sale of scrap or salvage material shall be available for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided further*, That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation shall be made quarterly to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress;"

The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 21, pertaining to contract authorization "Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army." The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting such authorization to $2,000,000 instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24, pertaining to contract authorization for the National Guard. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment limiting such authorization to $15,000,000 instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 30 to 35, inclusive, under "General provisions," clarifying House language pertaining to the application of personnel ceilings governing personnel employed by other agencies but performing work for the War Department. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

TITLE II—SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSIONS

Amendments Nos. 37 to 92, inclusive, provide for the rescission of certain appropriations made for the fiscal year 1940 through 1946 in the revised amount of $1,438,966,500. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3678) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is the War Department military appropriation bill. The original budget estimate was $5,716,791,500. The House reduced this $435,809,000, or to $5,280,000,000. The Senate restored $335,636,376, or all of the House cut but $100,000,000. In the conference the House receded on $201,000,000 and the Senate on $134,000,000, leaving the bill $234,261,000 below the budget estimate.

The bill as it left the House had $280,000,000 in contract authorizations. The Senate increased these contract authorizations to $543,490,000. The conference reduced it to $454,000,000 or a reduction of $89,490,000. There was a supplemental estimate for airplanes on this contract authorization of $103,000,000. The Senate added $34,000,000 new money because of the increased cost of gasoline. This is over and above the budget. The conference agreed to $24,000,000, or $10,000,000 below the amount put in by the Senate.

As to increases for various other items, the National Guard was increased $26,535,000, the Organized Reserves $25,000,000, the ROTC $25,000,000. The total increase on these last items by the Senate was $52,942,000, that is, over and above the budget estimate, and the conference agreed to $37,900,000, a reduction of approximately $15,000,000. There were other items, the conversion of vessels, and so forth, on which the Senate added $20,856,000, and we restored $8,000,000 finally. In other words, the new money added by the Senate was $108,000,000, and the conferees restored $73,000,000, or a reduction of $35,000,000.

When the bill went to the Senate it contained a reduction of 74,806 civilian employees. The Senate restored 35,204 of the 74,806. The conferees reduced this number and agreed to put back 16,435 employees, leaving a net reduction in the number of employees of 58,371, instead of 74,806.

The House took out $184,086,216 for the civilian employees, and the Senate restored $86,803,000. The conferees agreed on a restoration of a net sum of $41,200,000, leaving a net savings on civilian employees of approximately $143,000,000.

Of the officers, that is, not including nurses or warrant officers, the House provided in the original bill for a total number of 132,500. The House reduced this by 17,500, leaving 115,000. The Senate restored 10,000. The conferees agreed on a restoration of 5,000, leaving the Army with 120,000 officers, making a reduction of 12,500.

There was a reduction of 2,600 warrant officers. The Senate restored all of them, and we finally agreed to a reduction of about 650 at a saving of $2,500,000.

I think that covers the picture pretty well.

I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, the chairman has made a very comprehensive statement and I am in full accord with him. The members of the conference committee of the House and Senate did a good job, and I think we have a bill that the House will be satisfied with.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], a member of the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I think the significance of the conference report can be realized by a brief reference to four features in what was done.

Those four features would be: One, what we did with respect to civilian employees of the War Department; two, what we did with respect to officers; three, what we did with respect to the Air Force; and, four, what we did with respect to the National Guard.

First. With respect to civilian employees, in the bill that the House passed the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the War Department made reductions ranging from 5 percent to 25 percent in the number of civilian employees requested by the various branches of the War Department. The Senate restored those reductions in many instances 100 percent and in some instances not that much. The conference agreement on the civilian employees so far as the zone of the interior is concerned was to allow 50 percent of the Senate restoration. With respect to civilian employees overseas, the House bill originally made a straight reduction of 10 percent. The Senate restored the full 10 percent of that reduction. The conference agreement retained 60 percent of that 10-percent reduction originally voted by the House. In many of the zones overseas foreign nationals are available. This action refers to nationals of the United States who are civilian employees.

Mr. DURHAM. Can the gentleman give us the final figures on the Air Forces?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will be glad to do that as item three.

Second, with respect to officers, when the bill passed the House we made a reduction of about $96,000,000 in the officers, both commissioned and warrant officers. The Senate restored $55,000,000 for commissioned officers and $10,000,000 for warrant officers. The conference agreement restores $35,000,000, of which $27,500,000 is for commissioned officers and $7,500,000 for warrant officers. This means a saving of $60,000,000 from the original budget estimate and the conferees believe ample officer strength is provided, especially keeping in mind the fact that we have a great pool of well-trained experienced Reserve officers at this time.

It should also be borne in mind that during our deliberations on the bill, the War Department brought before us a

revised table of organization which reduced money requirements. The committee was not satisfied in our hearings with the showing of the War Department on officer distribution. They had 20,000 majors as against 6,000 first lieutenants and 4,000 second lieutenants, and 6,000 colonels. Obviously, that was wholly out of balance. In the revised table they brought before us they reduced the ratios of colonels and majors and made an increase in the lower grades.

Now, third, with respect to the Air Force and its planes. Members of the House will recall that when the bill left the House we provided $400,000,000 in cash for the procurement of airplanes and $280,000,000 contract authorization. Both of those items were stepped up by the other body.

One reason was that the cost of airplanes had gone up from the time the estimates were originally prepared. As I recall the figures, the Senate added $4,000,000 in cash for procurement of airplane spare parts and raised the contract authorizations from $280,000,000 to $497,000,000. The conferees agreed upon the cash and $430,000,000 in contract authorizations for the procurement of airplanes and things that go with them.

The total cash money for the Air Forces, as provided by the conference agreement, is $829,000,000, as compared with $773,000,000 proposed by the House and $858,000,000 proposed by the Senate. I have used round figures. Much of the increase in cash is to cover increased costs of gasoline.

Fourth, with respect to the National Guard. When the bill passed the House we did not cut the budget estimates for the National Guard. We gave the War Department every dollar that was requested for the National Guard. We were happy to find in our conference with the other body that the opinion of the Members of the Senate was in accord with the feeling of the Members of the House on the importance of the National Guard. They gave them not merely the budget estimate, but they gave them a considerable increase over the request of the budget. The final action on the National Guard gives them $24,000,000 more than the House figure. There was a general feeling by the conferees on both sides that in the present world situation it is important that the National Guard be kept in a position where the Reserve officers in the Guard will get the training they should have to keep them up to date, and to make them available should an emergency ever arise.

These four features I have mentioned may help Members to interpret the action taken on this important part of the national economy.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. How many planes are provided for in the appropriation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In our discussions in the conference we did not deal in numbers of airplanes but in terms of millions of pounds of aircraft. The fact that we did not make the authorization in numbers of planes is because discretion is left with the War Department as to the types of planes they will procure.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Will the gentleman tell me briefly about the constituted Reserve officers?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman have in mind the Organized Reserves as distinguished from the National Guard?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The conference agreement on the Organized Reserves appropriates $67,828,900 for the Organized Reserves as compared with $54,975,000 proposed by the House, and $80,661,000 proposed by the Senate.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 23, line 13, insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $11,000,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to say just one word further to what I have said previously. This was a conference that it was anticipated would be a very difficult conference. I want to express my personal appreciation for the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the committee, and for the work of the other conferees. I felt that we went into a difficult conference, but we found that working on it for the last couple of days we were able to reach a complete agreement. I believe that saves time for the House and really speaks for the unity of opinion when we are dealing with questions of national defense.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment, insert the following: "$5,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 29, line 1, insert ", and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $5,000,000."

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

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman did probably as much as anybody could with the Senate in this bill. The gentleman simply does not think there is a possible chance of holding the bill down, but that we have got to make these increases as indicated in the amendments.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. These amendments which we are now considering are practically all technical amendments. They are small amendments. The large items of consideration were, of course, personnel, the officers, the Air Force, and the guard.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment, insert the following: "$2,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 31, line 15, after the word "Office", strike out the balance of line 15 and all of lines 16 to 23 inclusive, and the word "Congress" in line 24, and insert ": *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, not more than $25,000,000 of the amounts received by the War Department during the fiscal year 1948 as proceeds from the sale of scrap or salvage material shall be available for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided further*, That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation shall be made quarterly to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19 and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 32, line 8, insert ", and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $5,000,000."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment, insert the following: "$2,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: On page 37, line 14, insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1948, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $25,000,000."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the

Senate No. 24 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment, insert the following: "$15,000,000."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may I inform the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that these amendments we are discussing are actual reductions. The prior amendment reduced the amount from $5,000,000 to $2,000,000 and this amendment reduces the amount from $25,000,000 to $15,000,000.

Mr. RICH. I want to congratulate the committee. The thing that makes me boil is the fact that the Senate holds out for these great amounts. They have been known over in that end of the Capitol to increase the appropriation bills of the House, notwithstanding the fact that our Appropriation Committee does everything it can to hold them down.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. May I inform the gentleman from Pennsylvania, after having been on this committee 11 years and considering a large number of appropriation bills, that there is much I would like to say along the line the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just spoken of but which the rules of the House forbid me saying.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 30 to 35, inclusive, be considered en bloc because they all pertain to the personnel ceiling.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 58, line 10, insert "with respect to War Department personnel."

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 58, line 11, strike out "Ordnance" and insert "War."

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 58, line 14, strike out "Department" and insert "Department or."

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 58, line 15, after the word "agencies", insert "if such personnel is charged to a ceiling determination for another agency under 607 (g) (1) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended."

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 58, line 18, strike out "other civilian components" and insert "Organized Reserves."

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 58, line 19, strike out "nor shall said section 14 of the act of May 24, 1946, apply with respect."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider Senate amendments 37 to 92, inclusive, en bloc. These are the rescission amendments. The House rescinded in all $1,100,000,000 in the 1942 to 1946 appropriations. The Senate increased this amount of rescissions by these amendments to $1,438,956,500.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 58, line 2, strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 58, after line 2, insert:

"Expediting production of equipment and supplies for national defense, 1940–46, $20,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 58, line 5, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 58, line 7, strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,300,000."

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 58, after line 7, insert:

"Army War College: Army War College, 1942–46, $2,500."

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 58, after line 7, insert:

"Adjutant General's Department: Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 1942–46, $7,000."

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 58, line 9, strike out "$203,000,000" and insert "$279,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 58, line 11, strike out "$125,000,000" and insert "$154,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 58, line 12, strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$121,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 58, line 13, after "$3,000,000" insert: "; and (4) claims of military and civilian personnel of the War Department, $1,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 58, lines 15 and 16, strike out "$160,000,000" and insert "$190,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 58, line 18, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 49: Page 58, lines 18 and 19, strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$42,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 58, lines 19 and 20, strike out "$55,000,000" and insert "$59,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 58, line 20, strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$27,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 58, line 21, strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$8,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 58, line 22, strike out "$40,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 58, lines 24 and 25, strike out "$90,000,000" and insert "$165,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 55: Page 59, lines 2 and 3, strike out "$190,000,000" and insert "$220,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 59, line 6, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$6,500,000."

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 59, line 8, strike out "$40,000,000" and insert "$120,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 59, line 10, strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$86,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 59, line 10, after "$30,000,000;" insert "(2) Military posts, $13,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 60: Page 59, line 11, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)."

Senate amendment No. 61: Page 59, line 11, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$21,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 59, line 14, strike out "$362,000,000" and insert "$363,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 59, line 17, strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$30,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 59, after line 17, insert:

"Special service schools: Special service schools, Army, 1942–46, $2,000, and subappropriations under this head are hereby decreased as follows: (1) Infantry School, $300; (2) Cavalry activities, $200; (3) Field Artillery activities, $750; and (4) Coast Artillery activities, $750."

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 59, after line 17, insert:

"Armored force: Instruction in armored force activities, 1942–46, $55,000."

Senate amendment No. 66: Page 59, line 19, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 59, after line 19, insert:

"United States Military Academy."

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 59, after line 19, insert:

"Pay of Military Academy, 1942–46, $35,000."

Senate amendment No. 69: Page 59, after line 19, insert:

"Maintenance and operation, United States Military Academy, 1942–46, $550,000."

Senate amendment No. 70: Page 59, after line 19, insert:

"National Guard: National Guard, 1942–46, $3,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 71: Page 59, line 21, strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$28,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 72: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Inter-American relations, War Department: Inter-American relations, War Department, 1943–46, $125,000."

Senate amendment No. 73: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, War Department."

Senate amendment No. 74: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Secretary of War, 1942–46, $1,874."

Senate amendment No. 75: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Staff, 1942–46, $19,176."

Senate amendment No. 76: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Adjutant General's Office, 1942–46, $29,321."

Senate amendment No. 77: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Cavalry, 1942–46, $7,021."

Senate amendment No. 78: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Inspector General, 1942–46, $49."

Senate amendment No. 79: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Judge Advocate General, 1942–46, $3,342."

Senate amendment No. 80: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Field Artillery, 1942–46, $2,358."

Senate amendment No. 81: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Chief of Finance, 1942–46, $11,667."

Senate amendment No. 82: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Infantry, 1942–46, $7,508."

Senate amendment No. 83: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Quartermaster General, 1942–46, $20,176."

Senate amendment No. 84: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of the Chief Signal Officer, 1942–46, $4,987."

Senate amendment No. 85: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Commanding General, Army Air Forces, 1942–46, $1,877."

Senate amendment No. 86: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Engineers, 1942–46, $40,857."

Senate amendment No. 87: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Ordnance, 1942–46, $24,553."

Senate amendment No. 88: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Chaplains, 1942–46, $3."

Senate amendment No. 89: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, National Guard Bureau, 1942–46, $3,615."

Senate amendment No. 90: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Salaries, Office of Chief of Coast Artillery, 1942–46, $11,613."

Senate amendment No. 91: Page 59, after line 21, insert:

"Office of the Secretary: Contingent expenses, War Department, 1942–46, $200,000."

Senate amendment No. 92: Page 59, line 22, strike out "$1,100,000,000" and insert "$1,438,966,500."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Blair Moody.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Illinois State Journal.

RELATING TO SAFETY IN BITUMINOUS COAL AND LIGNITE MINES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. J. Res. 130) relating to safety in bituminous-coal and lignite mines of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That whenever the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines or his duly authorized representative, shall, upon investigation or inspection of any coal mine, pursuant to the act of May 7, 1941 (55 Stat. 177), find that the safety standards, set forth in the Federal Mine Safety Code for Bituminous Coal and Lignite Mines of the United States, adopted pursuant to an agreement dated May 29, 1946, between the Secretary of the Interior, acting as Coal Mines Administrator, and the United Mine Workers of America, as published in 11 Federal Register 9017 (title 32, CFR., pt. 304, secs. 304.1–304.15), with respect to ventilation, rock-dusting, storage and use of explosives, roof and rib support, the use of water or water with a wetting agent or other means of dust control where mining operations raise an excessive amount of dust, and prevention of fires in the underground workings of the mines, are not being observed, he shall forthwith notify the owned and the operator of such mine and the State agency charged with the enforcement of safety measures in such mine of his findings and recommendations thereon, and request such owner, operator, and State agency severally to report to the Director of the Bureau of Mines the action taken with respect to said recommendations.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, shall, each 3 months, commencing September 1, 1947, report to the Congress of the United States with respect to the conditions of all bituminous coal and lignite mines investigated or inspected during the period, all recommendations and notices to the State agencies, and action taken by such mine owners, operators, and State agencies with respect to his findings and recommendations.

(b) The record of such inspections, findings, recommendations, notices, and reports, with respect thereto, shall be made available for public inspection as soon as practicable.

SEC. 3. (a) "Owner" includes a lessee and any person in possession or custody of a mine.

(b) "Operator" includes any agent, manager, superintendent, cooperative, or other person having control or supervision of a mine, directly or indirectly.

SEC. 4. This act shall remain in effect for a period of 1 year from the date this act is approved.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, this legislation will establish a code for health and safety in the coal mines. Under the resolution, enforcement of safety measures is left to the State agencies which are given the benefit of findings and recommendations resulting from Federal investigations and inspections, as are the owners and operators of the mines. The owners, operators, and State agencies are to report back to the Director of the Bureau of Mines the action taken with respect to these findings. The Secretary of the Interior is in turn required to report to Congress every 3 months with respect to the conditions of all mines investigated and inspected during the period; all recommendations and notices to State agencies, and action taken by the mine owners, operators, and State agencies with respect to his findings and recommendations. These records are to be made available for public inspection as soon as practicable.

The Labor Committee is of the opinion that those portions of the safety code which dealt with operating conditions, which experience shows have been the most prolific causes of mining disasters, should be immediately subjected to the closest scrutiny of the United States Bureau of Mines. The committee felt that the adoption of safety standards with respect to ventilation, rock dusting, storage and use of explosives, roof and rib support, the use of water or other means of dust control where mining operations raise an excessive amount of dust, and prevention of fires, all within underground workings of mines, would go far toward effectively preventing further disasters such as occurred at Centralia, Ill.

At present the Bureau of Mines has 182 Federal mine inspectors. This legislation will need an additional 100 mine inspectors and 50 safety engineers.

Statistics from the Federal Bureau of Mines show that in the last 35 years there have been 66,140 men killed, an average of 1,889 a year, in addition to 2,135 permanently disabled. If 80 percent of these 66,140 men were married and each left a widow and three children, there would be 211,649 widows and orphans and 2,135 incapacitated men living with families of 5—and the breadwinner totally disabled.

The resolution contains no additional enforcement or penalties but leaves such matters entirely within the province of the States. The act limits itself to remain in effect for 1 year from date it was approved. Thus, Congress places squarely upon the States the burden of making the mines safe and keeping them safe for the protection of men underground until Congress has had an opportunity to study the problem thoroughly, and makes it clear that if the States do not guard the safety of the miners, the Congress will act further.

If the States neglect to enforce the code for health and safety in the coal mines then it will be the duty of Congress to put more "teeth" in the Federal Mine Inspection Act. Coal mines operating in violation of safety regulations should be closed for the protection of the miners. We should give the Federal mine inspectors the power to close down unsafe mines until pronounced safe by Federal authority.

SAFETY IN THE MINES

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the piping voice of opposition to mine safety is again drowned by the throaty roar of the explosion coming out of the Old Bend coal mine in West Frankfort, Ill., where yesterday 28 men were reported dead.

Last spring Bob Howe, national representative of UMW, and Bill German, representing coal operators, took several of us Congressmen down into the coal mines underground. I wish every Member of this House that has opposition to this coal mine safety bill would go underground and see the conditions under which coal miners work. Their objections to a strong safety code would quickly vanish if they would stand underground when the face of the coal is being blasted and the earth would shake under their feet.

Coal mining is basic to American industry. We must keep our mines running in good order. The demands of a destroyed Europe and a hungry world rely to a great extent on American coal. The heavy machinery introduced into American mines during the past years has greatly stepped up our production. It has also increased the hazards.

I am not satisfied with this bill because it does not go far enough. Any violations of a safety code should make it possible for the Government to close down unsafe mines. We cannot rely on all the States for proper enforcement. Some States have good mine laws and good enforcement, and some States have not. All American mines should be safe. While this bill does not go far enough, I shall nevertheless support it because it is a step in the right direction. It puts forth the Federal safety code as a norm for all mines to follow. Just let me give you an example of a few of the things involved. Some operators are

delinquent in keeping sufficient rock-dusting and wetting in the mines to remove the danger of explosion from coal dust. Rock-dusting, as you may know, neutralizes coal dust. Machines to disseminate the rock dust should always be in proper order and should spread the rock dust close to the face of the coal. Some operators do not have sufficient rock dust in the coal mines so that the coal dust becomes dangerous. And again, take the subject of ventilation. As coal is mined methane gas is released from the face. Proper ventilation of pure air should at all times be kept close to the face. Some operators do not close the break-throughs between the avenues in which the mining is carried on and consequently the fresh air is short-circuited. Again, old works in the mines must be properly sealed off. Another frequent violation is that operators do not have permissible machinery. Electrical sparks frequently fly from the electrical-control boxes of the machinery. These should be properly covered to prevent ignition of coal dust or methane gas. In other cases the roof is not properly shored up so as to prevent roof falls, a frequent cause of accidents. These and many more are feature dangers that must be guarded against by constant vigilance in the mines.

A strong safety code should be enforced throughout all the mines in the United States. Otherwise the young men will not come to work in the mines. They will go to other fields. The average age of a miner today is over 50 years. This indicates that young, prospective coal miners are becoming wary of entering the mines. It would be a tragedy if the American coal mines do not have proper safety enforcements. I plead with you, therefore, to pass this bill. We should pass any further legislation that is necessary to guarantee, so far as is humanly possible, the safety of human lives of men who mine the black gold.

There are no coal mines in my district, but I know that the industries in my district depend, like all other American industries, upon the soundness of the coal-mining industry. Let us, by the passage of this legislation, show that we are deeply concerned over the safety of the lives of these American citizens that go underground for their daily work.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon mine No. 8 of the Old Ben Coal Corp. was racked by an explosion. This mine is situated just beyond the city limits of West Frankfort, Ill., a large mining town in my district. Latest reports show that 28 men have died in this disaster. Sixteen bodies have been removed and 12 others are still in the gas-filled pits. More than 200 men were working at the time of the explosion.

Mr. Speaker, I am a coal miner. I think I know as well as any man in this Chamber what is happening in West Frankfort this morning and what were the thoughts of those who were trapped inside the fire yesterday, able to communicate with the outside world but with nothing to do but wait for death. Many of these men were my friends. I pledged myself when I came to Congress that I would do everything in my power to make coal mining a safer occupation.

Today we are to vote on Senate Joint Resolution 130, a mine safety measure offered by my good friend GERALD LANDIS. This resolution will make the inspection record of every mine available to the Congress and I, for one, will scrutinize closely the inspection record of every mine that blows up in the future.

I know, as does the honorable gentleman from Indiana, that, contrary to statements of selfish interests, you can have increased safety and full coal production at the same time. More than 50 percent of the accidents in coal mining are caused by falls of roof and rib. In the old hand-loading days of mining a man working by himself or with a buddy could hear the warning cracking and popping of the top coal in time to leave a dangerous place. With the modern system of mining the clank of machinery and rush of motors leave all this to chance.

The Congress of the United States cannot legislate against individual accidents, the results of carelessness or acts of God. But we can legislate against this killing of men by the hundreds in gas or dust explosions. Any coal miner knows that you cannot have a gas explosion if there is no gas present in the mine. Any coal miner knows that there is no necessity for the presence of gas if you have proper, regulated ventilation and a sufficient volume of air to dilute the gas and render it harmless. Any coal miner knows that there is no necessity for a coal-dust explosion if the coal dust is not allowed to accumulate in dangerous quantities. If you must have coal dust, it can be rendered harmless if diluted with rock dust in sufficient quantity.

The presence of gas or coal dust in dangerous quantity is not the result of individual carelessness or an act of God. It is the result of an unwillingness on the part of management to provide the proper means to remove these dangerous elements from the mine. In this highly competitive industry the man who is willing to do what is right and safe must be governed by what his competitor is willing to do or be placed at a disadvantage in the coal market. In too many cases employers are too willing to take a chance on safety so that they may undersell their competitor and make a few more dollars.

The day is not far away when the mining industry of this Nation is going to miss the efforts of the thousands of miners killed in our coal mines. The average age of the coal miner of today is over 50 years. As these older men are killed in mine accidents or die of their service-connected disabilities, who is going to move the coal of this Nation? Not the younger generation, for they are staying away from the pits in great numbers. Do you think the widows of these 28 men are going to allow their children to follow in their fathers' footsteps? They will not. Not even if you double the present rate of wages.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared now or any time to support legislation that will make the coal mines a safer place in which to work. To me these disasters are inexcusable. I am not worried about the cry of State's rights, or duplication of effort, or double policing of the industry. I know our present efforts are not adequate, and if the Congress of the United States can pass one law that will stop this needless loss of life in part or in full, I am in favor of it. It is my sincere hope that, with increased safety as a goal, the next session of Congress will enact legislation which will for all time put an end to these tragic experiences prevalent in the coal-mining industry.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a communication, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JULY 25, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to inform you that on July 24, 1947, I transmitted to the Honorable Thomas J. Herbert, Governor of Ohio, my resignation as Representative in Congress of the United States from the Fourth District of Ohio effective at midnight September 2, 1947.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT F. JONES,
Member of Congress.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes, and that I may yield portions of that time if I so desire.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I contemplate the resignation of my very good friend, ROBERT F. JONES. When he came to Congress he was one of the youngest Members, and although he has been in Congress now nearly 8½ years he is still the youngest man in the Ohio delegation. I am sure the Ohio delegation, both Republicans and Democrats, wish him well in his new position. While his leaving will be a loss to the district which he has so ably represented and to the State of Ohio, it will be a much greater loss to the Nation. His outstanding work as a member of the Committee on Appropriations was distinctively Nation-wide in its scope. Anyone who saw him perform in his handling of the Interior Department Appropriation bill on this floor some few weeks ago surely realized that his work was distinctively Nation-wide. I have heard many Members say that by his masterful handling of that bill he proved that he is a master parliamentarian. His work on the Committee of Appropriations for the last few years has made him a national figure. And it has won for him the admiration of all the members of this great committee, whether Republicans or Democrats.

It is of his personal qualifications, though, that I comment with the most pleasure. He is a most wholesome and personable young man. I know of no young man who has developed faster, and

more deservedly, during my time in Congress. We all know that some men are more useful than others, but no one can long maintain a high place with his colleagues unless he has real merit. "BOB" JONES has many fine qualities of heart and mind that have earned for him the respect of all his colleagues. His keen mind and good judgment have established him as a man of great ability. His kind and courteous disposition has made for him many warm persona. friends. His courage and honesty have won for him the respect of all who know him. When he leaves this House he will have the respect of all who know him. Those who know him best respect him most.

Here he is today with nearly 9 years of service in the greatest legislative body in the world behind him, yet he has before him the best years of his life. I predict for him great success in the position to which the President of the United States has appointed him. He was appointed because he had a good record which could not be successfully assailed.

He comes from a fine family. Today, his mother, his wife, and his fine children are in the gallery, and they are justly proud of him. Of him I can say, with the poet Owen Meredith:

In the midnoon of manhood, with plenty to do,
And every incentive for doing it, too.
With the duties of life just sufficiently pressing
For prayer, and of joys more than most men for blessing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, my district, the Fifth District of Ohio, adjoins BOB JONES' district. The beautiful little city of Delphos is divided between the two districts right in the center of the town.

I came to Congress at the same time BOB JONES did. The affection I have for him is the affection I have for my own son. I can only say to you it is only gilding the lily to pay tribute to BOB JONES. He was a marked man in school, he was a marked man in college, and he was a marked man in the service of his county and the service of his State. Happy is the State and fortunate is the Nation that has a public servant such as ROBERT F. JONES.

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

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. As a member of the Interior Department Appropriations Committee, may I say that the Democrats have the very highest regard and admiration for BOB JONES. He has made not only a competent but an honest chairman and member of that committee. I hate to see him leave Congress, and I concur in what the gentleman has said.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have watched wonderful men leave these halls, such as Lindsay Warren and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], as well as various other Members to serve in other branches of Government. The Nation never had a greater public servant than ROBERT JONES. The President has chosen wisely and well.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to subscribe to the fine things that have been said about BOB JONES' service in the House of Representatives. His has been an outstanding record and an inspiration to every Member of Congress. He has been a great public servant, and I predict further distinguished service for him in his new work.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my respects to the gentleman from Ohio, BOB JONES. I think without doubt he is one of the finest, clean-cut gentlemen that I have ever known in all my life. I have been associated with him here for several years and when I was on the Committee on Appropriations I did not know anyone who worked harder to try to do a good job. He is honest; he is honorable; he worked hard and is interested in doing what he thinks is best for his country. He succeeded here in the House. He succeeded back home. He will succeed as a member of the Federal Communications Commission. I wish BOB JONES and his family Godspeed and I am sure that he will make a success and do a grand job for the United States in the job that the President has appointed him to. It is a great loss to the Congress of the United States for him to go from our midst.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let this opportunity pass without saying a word about the service of BOB JONES and the type and character of man I think he is.

I do not think there have been better men to serve in the House of Representatives than BOB JONES. I shall miss him very much personally, and I know that the House will miss his splendid ability and his great efficiency. He is going to a place where he can, and I think will, be of great service. He is going to a Commission which I think will not be hurt by the infusion of some BOB JONES blood.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman, the majority leader [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great pleasure and a real privilege to have served in this body with BOB JONES, of Ohio. I consider him one of our outstanding Members—a man of unquestioned integrity and honesty. He has shown but one purpose, and that is to do the right as he sees the right in the interest of all the people of this great country.

As chairman of the Interior Department Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, he had a most difficult assignment. In his handling of that bill he showed a detailed knowledge of every single item in it. He always supported his arguments with facts.

The services of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] will be missed. His appointment to the Federal Communications Commission by the President is a well-deserved recognition of BOB JONES' ability. I predict that he will serve with distinction on that body, as he has served with distinction as a Member of Congress. He takes with him our affectionate regards and best wishes for his continued success.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, BOB JONES came here as an able young lawyer. As a result of the most diligent effort in committee and on the floor, and tremendous study, day and night, he became one of the ablest parliamentarians we had on the floor, and one of the most effective committee members and one of those who was best able to handle a bill and put it across on the floor.

I am sure that in the work he is tackling in the Federal Communications Commission he will make a record which will stand out just as his record has stood out here.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Bobbie knows that my family and I love him. There is really no need to elaborate on that statement. However I would like to offer a toast which Rip Van Winkle made popular in fiction years ago. It is one which has always appealed to me: "Here's to your health and your family's good health and may you all live long and prosper."

My family and I wish that for BOBBIE JONES and his family.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, as one who came here with BOB JONES as a freshman in 1939, in the Seventy-sixth Congress, I feel a pang that he is leaving the ranks of those of us who came here with the spirit of '76. But BOB JONES has made an especial mark for himself with his rugged integrity, his keen intellect, and his unflagging industry, his great courage. While we regret to see him leave here, I predict he will make a great mark in public service, in the important and arduous task that he takes up under this Presidential appointment. We all can bid him Godspeed and good luck.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have watched BOB JONES perform, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, at close range. I have seen him develop into one of the most effective chairmen I have ever seen perform on this floor. The way he handles his bills is absolutely superb. It is a fine thing that America can have such men as BOB JONES to serve in Congress. I know him, and I know his family, and I know what kind of an American he is and they are, and I wish him continued success in his new field of endeavor.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it would take a far better master of language to pay adequate tribute to BOB JONES than I. But if we were to enumerate all those

qualities that make a good legislator, BOB JONES has every one of them. I would not omit one. Hard work, intelligence, fairness, honesty, integrity, thoroughness, and so on down the line. In addition to that, he is a great guy and a great citizen. We wish him well in his new activity.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Communications Commission will be the gainer and this House will be the loser when my good friend and long-time associate, ROBERT F. JONES of Ohio, leaves these halls to assume his new responsibilities as a member of the FCC.

My own emotions at this time are difficult to put into words. Never has there been an occasion in the history of these United States when the wisdom, the courage, the perseverence, the understanding, and the integrity of BOB JONES was more needed in Congress. Since he took his seat in the Seventy-sixth Congress, this country has fought and won a Second World War, our national debt has soared to astronomical figures. We are being called upon to feed, clothe, house, and administer medical aid to the whole world. We are faced with the necessity of combatting dictatorships in peace as we have faced totalitarianism in war. The vigorous thinking of the new Members of this House cries out for the leavening influence of experienced Members of longer service.

The gentleman from Ohio is a living example of the value of experience. He has ably served his constituents of the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio. His incisive mind has been of inestimable value in the deliberations of the subcommittee on State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary, in which capacity I have long been associated with him. His wide knowledge and his quick grasp of involved situations have made him one of the most efficient chairmen of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department who have ever acted to save the taxpayers' dollars. Not only has he served the people of his district and the people of his State, he has also served the people of every congressional district in every State in the Union. He has fought, without regard for his own health, that our Constitution might be preserved and that every American citizen might have more abundant life, free from the undue burden of governmental expenses.

Yes. I regret to see my old friend go. However, my regret is cushioned by the awareness that his chosen field of service is one of vital importance. I am confident that as a member of FCC Mr. JONES will have a signal opportunity to continue his statesmanlike career. Communications are the life lines of this Nation. It is indeed encouraging to know that the policies of the FCC will bear the imprint of Mr. JONES' courageous thinking for many years to come. No one of us who have had the truly great inspiration of working with him can gainsay the fact that the FCC is richer by a man who is a daily practitioner of Christian Americanism.

If the choice were ours, we would have you stay with us. But yours is the choice and you have chosen your post of duty. But when you go, the heartfelt good wishes and prayers of those who know your worth go with you, ROBERT JONES of Ohio—statesman, legislator, and patriot.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would not let this opportunity pass without adding my words of affection, admiration, and respect for our colleague, BOB JONES, who is going to leave us for a post on the Federal Communications Commission. There is not much new that can be added save to say that Congress is losing one of its most able Members, and in the well-chosen words of our minority leader, the Federal Communications Commission will receive a most valued member.

I, too, came to Congress along with BOB JONES, and during these 9 years that we have served together I have learned so well to know those sterling qualities of BOB JONES that have endeared him to all of us who have served here.

We wish him well and Godspeed in his new assignment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the legislative committee that has jurisdiction over legislation affecting the Federal Communications Commission I am somewhat familiar with the responsibilities that face a member of that commission. Having observed the diligence and the intelligence with which BOB JONES has pursued his career in the House of Representatives, I feel certain that he will add strength to that important independent commission of our Government.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as a Member from Ohio, I want to concur in every statement that has been made relative not only to my colleague but to my friend, BOB JONES.

You as Members of Congress will miss a fine Congressman. The district he has so ably represented in the past will miss a great Representative, and we of the Ohio delegation will certainly lose a fine colleague.

I am sure I speak the voice of his district, his friends, and I know of this Congress when I say to you: Bob, we wish you well and the best of luck.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, there was a group of almost a hundred new Members in the Seventy-sixth Congress, including the Honorable ROBERT JONES, of Lima, Ohio. I have observed my colleagues who came with me to the Seventy-sixth Congress from that time down to the end of this first session of the Eightieth Congress. I think no man in that group has performed better service, has developed into a better judge of governmental affairs and governmental problems or has thrown himself more wholeheartedly into the problems of the Congress than has ROBERT JONES.

Power to him in his new environment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, while I am not a Methodist I wish to voice a profound "amen" to every word that has been said in these encomiums of BOB JONES. I never had the privilege of working in committee with him, but I want to add these words, that I know to be true from public and private contact with him here, and they have not been said as yet: We love him for the enemies he has made in the discharge of his duty. We love him for the sweetness of his disposition, for his million-dollar smile, and for the poise he has manifested on all occasions in this House. We love him. That is the summarizing of the whole tribute.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the closing hours of Congress prevent us from properly extolling the virtues of this great American from Ohio, BOB JONES. We have observed him as a great Member of the House. We confidently believe Bob will be one of the greatest additions to the Federal Communications in the history of that illustrious body.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], the dean of the Ohio delegation quoted from Owen Meredith, who said—

> At life's midnoon
> With plenty to do,
> And plenty of incentive
> For doing it too—

There was indeed an incentive for the appointment of BOB JONES. The citizenry of our Commonwealth have always said "We hear people, but who is sincere?"

BOB JONES is sincere.

As a county prosecutor he never was a fixer. As a Congressman he never tried to "just please." He was a man who always asked, "What is right?"—then he did it. He never asked "Who wants it?"

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, BOB JONES came to the Seventy-sixth Congress as a new Member at the same time I did. Since then he has been one of my closest and best friends. I liked and admired him from the first. Through the years that feeling has steadily grown. I have always respected his sincerity, his integrity, and particularly his ability. I have never seen or heard anyone handle an appropriation bill on the floor of the House of Representatives with more judgment, clarity, finesse, and ability than that exercised by ROBERT F. JONES, of Ohio. His departure from our midst is a real loss to the Congress and the people. I am glad his services will be continued in

Government. BOB, here's wishing you happiness and success in your new career.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I have also known BOB JONES since the Seventy-sixth Congress. It was my privilege to serve with him on the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that handled the Department of Interior appropriation bill. I can vouch for all the fine things that have been said about BOB JONES.

While we are always happy to see our friends progress in life, we are reluctant to lose their association, and one of the happy thoughts I have in extending my congratulations to a Member who will not be in this House at the next session is the fact that he will remain in Washington, where he will continue his outstanding service to his country, and where we can have the benefit of his counsel, and the pleasure of his association.

The President's nomination of ROBERT F. JONES to the Federal Communications Commission and his subsequent confirmation by the Senate has met with spontaneous approval in and out of Congress, and I can well understand this, since having the privilege and pleasure of taking my seat in the Seventy-sixth Congress at the same time as my colleague, who was so wisely chosen by his constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of the great State of Ohio.

From county prosecuting attorney in Ohio to five terms in Congress, and then elevation to the Federal Communications Commission by Presidential appointment and unanimous approval by the United States Senate is an outstanding accomplishment for a young man who has just passed his fortieth birthday. And I am certain that the record will show that this young man did not stop there—in the parlance of the day, he is destined to go places.

BOB JONES has the wisdom, judgment, aggressiveness, and will to get things done, and done in the right way. This I have intimately observed during my association with him on the Appropriations Committee, of which I had the privilege to become a member this year, and the good fortune to serve on the Interior subcommittee of which Bob was our capable, keen-minded, and hard-working chairman.

A real American, a capable and conscientious public servant, and a man among men, BOB JONES is the type of citizen of which our country can well feel proud. He is the representative type that has helped to make this country great, and whose services could not be used to better advantage than by having him continue in the service of our Federal Government.

Congratulations, BOB JONES. May the days ahead be filled with greater success than you have already earned, and which you so well deserve. You will always be in our thoughts, and I know I express the sentiments of every Member here when I say, come back and visit with us often.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks with reference to the Honorable ROBERT F. JONES at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this occasion to pass without paying respect to the accomplishments of ROBERT JONES, our colleague from Ohio. I wish to congratulate him upon being selected as a member of the important board of the Federal Communications Commission. BOB JONES has served faithfully in Congress. He is a man of courage, great ability, and splendid background. I am sorry that we must lose him in Congress but I know that he will serve the Nation well in his new capacity. I wish him good fortune and a long life of continued service to his country.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to say a few words in commendation of BOB JONES. Bob and I entered the House together in 1939 and he has proven himself to be one of the most able Members of this body. May I join in seconding all of the good things which have been said here today about a very good man, who will make his mark in his new work on the Federal Communications Commission. If ever a man was worthy of such a position, ROBERT JONES of Ohio is that man.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, "That fellow, BOB JONES—I sure wish he was on our team!"

That statement came from Mr. Charles E. Cone, of Ephrata, Wash., and the official Columbia Basin Commission of the State of Washington. It came after the first passage through the House of the Interior Appropriations bill.

It was an outright compliment from one who believes in sound western development. It was a compliment from a man who did not agree with the cuts which had been made in the President's budget for western development in general and the Columbia Basin project in particular. It was a compliment to the legislative craftsmanship of the Honorable ROBERT JONES, of Ohio.

That we violently disagree with the achievements in cutting down on many items in the Interior Appropriations bill is primarily by reason of a difference of geographical viewpoint. We in the West, of course, have no objection to the outlay of Federal funds in the East for the purposes of flood control on torrential streams. We rejoice at the improvement of harbors and navigable waterways, even though in many instances these outlays are not repaid, excepting in the security they give to those whose industry results in tax payments.

Our western development will and, of course, should be repayable to the maximum amount and by the standard of eastern development, reimbursable twice, both in project funds and in the impetus to tax-paying industry which they will develop.

All of us admire a legislative craftsman and BOB JONES in his handling of the Interior Appropriations bill, even though we in the West do not agree, proved himself to be one of great ability.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] himself.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, of course I am very grateful for the kind words that have been said about me here this afternoon. I choose, however, to consider them as impersonal and that they represent an ideal to which you Members of the House, with whom I have served, would like to see a colleague of yours adhere. I deeply appreciate the confidence of the people of the Fourth District of Ohio who have elected and reelected me to serve them for nearly a decade as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is nearly the last bulwark of liberty and the last deliberative body in the world. We must not forget, and I know the Members here are always conscious of the fact, that we still are free men and that so long as freemen exist there is always a strong and great legislative body.

I go to the position to which I have been appointed by the President of the United States with a background of the traditions of this House of Representatives. I go as a recent Member of a great legislative body, close to the people; a legislative body that cherishes and defends freedom. We may differ at times over the way we arrive at the solution of our problem, but we discus them, we debate, decide and when the majority speaks, we all abide by that decision. That is what distinguishes us from nearly every country in the world. Today the world is on fire and police governments are the rule rather than the exception.

The nearly 10 years I have spent here I know will assist me greatly in the duties I shall take up on September 3. To have the point of view of men and women who are trying to preserve liberty and freedom is a distinguished background and will be of great assistance in serving on the Federal Communications Commission which has so much to do with freedom of speech and freedom of communications throughout the United States, in fact throughout the world.

Again I thank you, I thank you sincerely. I appreciate immensely the many fine kindnesses you have shown me in the 8½ years I have served as a Member of this body. It has been my privilege in that time to serve under the greatest Speakers that the House of Representatives has ever had. It has been my pleasure to serve with men and women of sterling character. I am grateful, indeed, to have been a Member of this, the last great outpost of liberty in the world.

I shall miss you all, of course. Our relationship may never be the same again because, after all, I am leaving the House of Representatives to become a "bureaucrat." I do not expect any quarter from any one in this House in that capacity, because I gave no quarter as a member of the Appropriations Committee to any

of the bureaucrats. I hope sincerely, though, that when I do come back you can give to me the same clean bill of health you have given me as I leave you today.

TRIBUTE TO HON. ROBERT F. JONES AND HON. LEO F. RAYFIEL

Mr. CELLER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, offer full praise to BOB JONES and say to him, "Hail and farewell."

There is another Member of our body who is marked out for distinction, and that is my distinguished friend, our gallant colleague from Brooklyn, N. Y., LEO RAYFIEL, who has been designated as United States judge for the eastern district of New York. His appointment has recently been confirmed by the Senate. Leo, I am sure, will make a good judge, because he was always a good lawyer and a good Congressman. Good Congressmen make good judges. They make the laws, and thereby have the greatest equipment to interpret the laws. I would say about Leo that we love him for the many friends that he has made. He is a benign sort of fellow, generous, fair-minded, studious, of considerable erudition and modesty. I am sure that when he is a judge he will put human rights above property rights. I am sure that he is going to be fair and just to litigants and tolerant to the lawyers. Some judges are very intolerant. The story I will tell you could not be made applicable to Judge RAYFIEL. One of the present members of the Supreme Court was hearing a case argued, and the present Secretary of War, General Royall, was the attorney for the defense, and one of the judges was particularly intolerant and he kept closely questioning General Royall. General Royall tried his best to answer, but it was only with the greatest difficulty that he could answer all those vexatious and unnecessary questions that this judge directed to him, until finally asked another question, the general said, "If I, Judge, would answer that question, it would indeed be like the blind leading the blind." I am sure Judge RAYFIEL will be courteous and considerate and fair and most tolerant to litigants while a judge. He has marked out a splendid career in the House. He will hew out an even more glorious career as a judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

DECLARATION OF RECESS DURING REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the week the Speaker may declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERRING OF MEMBERSHIP ON SPEAKER MARTIN IN AMVETS

Mr. McDONOUGH. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to a meeting that is to be held in the Committee on Ways and Means room in the Old House Office Building this evening at 8 o'clock, at which time our honorable and distinguished Speaker the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will be given an honorary membership in the new House of Representatives Post, No. 19, of AMVETS. All Members are cordially invited to attend the meeting. The principal speaker of the evening will be the distinguished minority leader, Mr. SAM RAYBURN. I hope that all the Members will take notice of this and come out and do proper honor to our distinguished Speaker.

The AMVETS have been given a charter by the Eightieth Congress. It is one of the fine, vigorous, and patriotic veterans organizations of World War II. Mr. MARTIN'S honorary membership will add dignity to the ranks of the American Veterans of World War II, whose ranks now contain many distinguished citizens throughout the Nation. The AMVETS are doing a fine job in all posts of the Nation for veterans of World War II. The future of this organization gives every promise of becoming one of the great and beneficial veteran's organizations which will inspire and keep alive our love and patriotic zeal for the United States of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "employees," the following: "who shall be entitled to accumulate annual leave to the maximum of 90 work days exclusive of the time actually and necessarily occupied in going to and from the continental United States and such time as may be necessarily occupied in awaiting sailing or flight,".

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 101 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "Commonwealth of the Philippines" the following: "(or the Republic of the Philippines)".

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 106 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 106. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amount of $400,000,000 for the purpose of paying compensation to the extent authorized in this title and of such sum, not to exceed $8,400,000 shall be available to pay the expenses of the Commission. All moneys heretofore or hereinafter appropriated under authority of this title shall remain available until April 30, 1951."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. The bill that has just been read is not the same number as the bill containing these provisions that was objected to last Monday on the Consent Calendar. Is it in order to consider a Senate bill under these conditions?

The SPEAKER. Under suspension of the rules either a House or a Senate bill may be considered.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any need to take much time on this bill inasmuch as it was explained last Monday when the Consent Calendar was called. Only one person objected to it then, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and he will explain his reasons shortly.

The bill, as originally introduced and passed by the Senate, consisted of three amendments to the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1947, which we passed last year. First, it allows employees of the War Damage Commission who go to the Philippines to carry on during the next 4 years the work of examining and settling claims to accumulate up to 90 days annual leave, which merely gives the same privilege which Government employees in this country ordinarily enjoy.

The second amendment recognizes the fact that the Commonwealth of the Philippines, which existed when this act was passed, is now the Republic of the Philippines, and the language of the law is changed accordingly.

The third amendment is the one about which there is some disagreement. In the Rehabilitation Act authorizing $400,000,000 to be used in payment of legitimate war-damage claims in the Philippines, 1 percent or $4,000,000 was provided for the administrative expenses of the Commission. At that time the question was raised in the Committee on Insular Affairs, where the bill was handled, as to whether that would be enough. They asked for $4,000,000 because that seemed like a great deal of money so we let it go at that. Now they come back and present the load of work that is before them, and it is obvious that they cannot, with that amount of money, examine with adequate care all the million-and-a-quarter claims that it appears will come in. They have 4 years in which to examine more than a million claims. That is at the rate of 250,000 claims a year, which means that almost 1,000 claims have to be settled each work day. This requires, on the estimate basis of one person handling two claims a day,

500 employees just to adjudicate the claims, to say nothing of secretarial and other help.

The question is, Do we want to increase from 1 to 2.1 the percentage of the $400,000,000 to be authorized for the Commission's administrative expenses so that it can carefully examine these claims and eliminate fraudulent or unworthy claims; or do we want just to send these men out with $400,000,000 and a checkbook to pass out the American taxpayers' money without proper protection?

We all know the zeal and diligence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his efforts to economize. I myself think that in this case he is following a policy which is the opposite of economy, because this bill does not in the least increase the total amount of money appropriated. It only decides whether the Commission is to have a large enough share for administrative expenses so that it can reasonably be expected to spend it wisely, instead of wasting much of it. If it does not have enough money to build up an adequate staff, it simply cannot spend it wisely.

This bill comes out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with unanimous approval. It was given to the Committee on Foreign Affairs only because the Committee on Insular Affairs, where this legislation was originally developed, no longer exists.

I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] for yielding to me. I merely wish to say something about the membership of the Commission under discussion. Mr. Frank Waring, Chairman of the Commission is a man of great ability. He has the respect and confidence of many Members of this House. He has appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations and I wish to state that he made a fine impression on the membership of the committee with his testimony regarding Philippine needs and requirements. Members of the committee believe Chairman Waring is a man of exceptional ability and that in the administration of these funds he is not forgetting the interests of the American taxpayer. Another member of the Commission is well-known to the membership of this House. He is the Honorable Francisco Delgado, who represented the Philippine Commonwealth Government in this body. He was then the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines. Mr. Delgado and his beautiful and capable wife will not be forgotten by scores of Members because of their delightful personalities and their daily efforts to bind stronger the friendships between the peoples of the Philippine Islands and those of the United States of America. Mr. Delgado recently completed a long journey throughout the northern provinces of the Philippine Islands. He was kind enough to send me a copy of the report which he made following this journey. The report indicates a most careful investigation of damage and claims. I have not heard the testimony on this particular bill but I felt Members should know something about at least two members of the commission with whom so many of you are acquainted. I have confidence in Chairman Waring and feel that he will continue making unbiased reports on his administration to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman two or three questions? The $400,000,000 is an obligation of the United States, is it not?

Mr. JUDD. That is correct. The Congress assumed it last year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is no reasonable discussion that can be raised on that matter at all. Is there any reason for us to assume that the Filipinos will get back on their feet industrially and otherwise until they have a substantial amount of these claims paid, with their homes destroyed and their industries thrown out of balance in every way that can be imagined and with their principal cities destroyed? It is a very difficult problem. I have been through the islands since the war and I have seen the damage there. I know something about Philippine industry as I have studied it closely for many years.

It seems to me the best way we can possibly save money to the American taxpayers is to let these claims be administered expeditiously and in a businesslike manner. I know that we could not take a group to the Philippines and handle this $400,000,000 bill on the basis of 1 or 2 percent of the total amount. There is no insurance company that could handle it on that basis. I think the gentleman's committee is very wise in providing for this additional use of funds for administration, so that these claims can be settled and this work expedited and the Filipino people gotten back on their feet so that they can produce for themselves. I am very much in favor of the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman. I should have stated earlier that this bill was originally introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] who was formerly chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs and by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], the present chairman of the Committee on Public Lands.

We have the Senate bill before us today instead of their bills only because it is more convenient, the Senate having already passed the bill.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. May I ask if these claims are the claims of people other than citizens of the United States or people from the United States who had investments there and the Filipinos themselves or do these claims include any of the Japanese nationals?

Mr. JUDD. Citizens of the United States as well as of the Philippines can put in claims if they use the money for rebuilding or reopening the business or home or mine or factory which was damaged. Japanese nationals are not more to adjudicate these claims than would ordinarily be the case is because each claim has to be examined to determine whether the person who puts in the claim is an American or Philippine citizen or of certain other categories; second, whether he was a collaborator with the Japanese during the occupation; third, whether he was the actual owner of the property because the homes and papers of thousands were destroyed, the courthouses were destroyed includ- eligible. One reason why it will cost ing deeds and public records. Then the proper value of the property has to be determined. This commission cannot operate like an insurance company which pays on the basis of the face value of a policy where there is no question as to ownership or value, and so forth. Furthermore the property to be appraised may be in any one of 10,000 islands. So the task is enormous.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Is it assumed that the liabilities are all those of the United States—are all just claims that can be established to be paid?

Mr. JUDD. No. If the total of all claims determined valid exceeds the $400,000,000 authorized, the payments will be reduced proportionately. It is provided further that if any reparations or indemnity in money or bullion is recovered from the Japanese, it shall be applied to this fund. If $100,000,000 should come back, our obligation would be reduced correspondingly.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I think that Members who are not members of the committee are entitled to that information.

Mr. JUDD. Certainly. I shall be glad to answer any other questions.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wanted to corroborate the gentleman's statement to the effect that when the committee considered this bill last year the question of the percentage allowance for administration of the act was considered, and all of us thought that the percentage set in the bill was insufficient. However, those who were supporting the measure felt that they could get along with that amount of money. Naturally, we did not give them more than they asked for. However, we all recognized, or at least we all doubted their ability to get along with that small percentage. I simply wanted to verify what the gentleman said.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], who is one of the authors of the resolution.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been very familiar with this bill from its inception. It arose in the Insular Affairs Committee last year, of which committee I was chairman at that time. At the time the bill was passed a number of the members of the committee who had had some observation of insurance companies in settling claims felt that 1 percent was entirely too small to make any businesslike or economical handling of these

claims. To begin with, the islands are 10,000 miles away, and a great many people are going to have to be transported to the Philippines to do the job of properly examining and settling these claims. When you get down there, there are 10,000 of those islands. There will have to be a great deal of traveling back and forth, because you cannot intelligently settle a small claim except on the ground where the claim arose. Here is a man who claims his shack was burned. You have to find out whether it was actually burned and whether he actually owned it or not. Here is a man who has a carabao that was destroyed by the Japanese. You have to find out whether he actually owned a carabao. Unless you have adequate personnel to go down there and handle these things in the proper way it will cost this country perhaps one to two hundred million dollars in losses by maladministration. I think if we deny the Commission enough funds to adequately provide for personnel to go down there and intelligently handle this job it will be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

This bill does not require the appropriation of any more money. This money for administrative purposes will be taken out of the $400,000,000 which the Congress has already provided. It is just a question as to whether or not we handle it in a businesslike way, send intelligent people down there to go into these claims, and deny those that are groundless and deny those that are excessive and pay those that are just. Quite a number of you gentlemen have had some experience in handling the liquidation of claims for insurance companies and liability companies. You have represented liability companies as lawyers. If you have, you know there is not a liability company in America, with all their skill, who can begin to settle claims right here on the ground for 1 percent. It takes 6 or 8 percent for the average liability company. You gentlemen who have had experience along that line well know that.

So the passage of this bill means that this $400,000,000 that the taxpayers of America are digging up to settle these claims and bring about the rehabilitation of the Philippines simply means whether you are going to go into it in a businesslike way and allow the personnel in charge to have enough money to go into the matter, or whether you just put somebody on a stump out there and distribute the money without any rhyme or reason.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, certain committee amendments were added to this bill largely through the commendable efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]. These amendments, as I am sure he will explain, provided essentially the same restrictions with respect to loyalty of American personnel on the Commission and screening by the FBI as we have put into other legislation. Also provisions for preventing, if possible, use of Filipino personnel or payments to persons who are Communists.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me a little time?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, our committee has taken up a recommendation for legislation that was sent to the Speaker and referred by him to our committee, to assist persons in the Philippine Islands. I am wondering just how that would affect legislation that is before our Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. JUDD. I am sorry; I do not know just what the gentlewoman refers to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We have had very many requests for appropriations but I am not going to be against this bill——

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There are two or three propositions dealing with the people in the Philippines. This bill deals only with war damage which we propose to pay. It goes back to the very inception of the fact that the Philippine Government was a part of this country, you might say, when the war broke out. We had not given them their independence. We went in there and drove the Japs out and did a lot of destruction ourselves with our own guns, our own bombs. This is a liability of the United States.

In addition to that the Philippine Republic is certainly going to need an enormous amount of assistance from the United States if it is to stand on its own feet as a republic. We know that. I am sure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will find and that her committee will find that the $400,000,000 of war damage does in no way clean up the Philippine bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but I cannot yield further.

I wish to state that I would like very much to send a group of members from my committee to study the whole Philippine question out there insofar as compensation for the disabled is concerned; but I was told it was late to bring up anything of that sort. It seems to me this is a foreign-affairs Congress. I say it is not fair to send so much to foreign countries that we have nothing left for our own. Anyway, we have spent so much in foreign countries and will spend much more, and our Committee on Veterans' Affairs has not as yet been able to secure any more money in order to send the members of our committee through the country inspecting the Veterans' Administration hospitals, the Veterans' Administration regional offices and branch offices for which inspection there is such great need. Millions and millions of dollars have been sent to foreign countries. It is time we took care of our disabled. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is really a foreign-affairs Congress. During the war our soldiers came first; in peace foreign countries come first and other nondisabled in the United States. It is not just, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota reserves 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as the first session of the Eightieth Congress draws to a close, many questions have been asked regarding enactment of further legislation of direct benefit to the war veterans.

While I cannot at this time say definitely as to what further legislation may be acted upon during this first session and what may be acted upon when we reconvene for the second session in January, I would like to point out a few pertinent facts.

Last January 6, President Truman in his message to the Congress on the State of the Union, referred to additional veterans' legislation as follows:

> Exclusive of mustering-out payments and terminal-leave pay, the program for veterans of all wars is costing over $7,000,000,000 a year—one-fifth of our total Federal budget. This is the most far-reaching and complete veterans' program ever conceived by any nation.
>
> Except for minor adjustments, I believe that our program of benefits for veterans is now complete. In the long run, the success of the program will not be measured by the number of veterans obtaining financial aid or by the number of dollars we spend. History will judge us not by the money we spend, but by the further contribution we enable our veterans to make to their country. In considering any additional legislation, that must be our criterion.

That statement can leave no question about the opposition of President Truman to additional veterans' legislation of any consequence.

Further than this the House of Representatives' Committee on Veterans' Legislation has had reports from Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Director of the Veterans' Administration, against scores of the measures now pending in the House of Representatives.

In addition, he reports that the bills cannot be considered to be in accord with the program of the President's Budget Bureau. That simply means that the President is against these bills.

For example, on July 18, General Bradley wrote to the committee regarding H. R. 3584, a bill to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

General Bradley furnished the committee a report on the estimated cost of such legislation under date of June 3, 1947. In his letter of July 18, 1947, General Bradley said:

> The Veterans' Administration has been advised by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, that there is no objection to the presentation of such report to the committee and that this bill could not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President.

In view of this expressed opposition of the President, it certainly would be fair to assume that he would likely veto any such bill that the Congress might send to him.

However, notwithstanding the opposition of President Truman to the enactment of additional veterans' legislation, as expressed in his message on the State of the Union, the House of Representatives and the Congress have passed many meritorious acts for the benefit of war veterans.

I call attention to the following favorable actions of the House of Representatives and the Congress:

From Veterans' Affairs Committee:

H. R. 3961, increasing the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American and Civil War Veterans. Passed House June 30, 1947. Passed Senate July 19, 1947.

H. R. 3889, establishing the presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases. Passed House July 21, 1947.

H. R. 1353, Public Law 5, to repeal time limit for reinstatement of national service life insurance.

H. R. 1327, Public Law 34, to provide for renewal for a fifth 5-year period, 5-year level premium term insurance plan for World War I veterans.

House Joint Resolution 196, Senate Joint Resolution 115, Public Law 91, providing for the continuation of offices of Veterans' Administration in the Philippines.

H. R. 2368, Public Law 115, increasing the revolving fund from $1,500,000 to $3,000,000 for the purpose of making loans to veterans of World War II undertaking vocational training.

House Concurrent Resolution 54, provide for use of Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa. Passed House July 23, 1947.

H. R. 2181, amending veterans regulations pertaining to institutional on-farm training for veterans. Passed House May 12, 1947.

H. R. 3739, providing for Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va. Passed House July 17, 1947. Passed Senate July 23, 1947.

From Judiciary Committee:

H. R. 1888, Public Law 216, to incorporate AMVETS. Passed House April 9, 1947. Passed Senate July 16, 1947.

H. R. 3398, Public Law 126, extending time for bringing alien fiancées to the United States.

H. R. 3149, Public Law 213, expedite admission to United States of alien spouses and minor children of veterans. Passed House June 16, 1947. Passed Senate July 16, 1947.

Numerous private bills authorizing admission to the United States of veterans' alien wives barred by existing law.

From Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 1426, extending veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of exservicemen. Passed House July 21, 1947.

H. R. 739, providing for protection of veterans and career-service employees in connection with reduction of forces in Federal service. Passed House July 21, 1947.

H. R. 966, to amend section 14 Veterans' Preference Act. Passed House June 19, 1947.

H. R. 1389, to amend section 2 Veterans' Preference Act. Passed House June 19, 1947.

S. 1180, issuance of Gold Star Mother commemorative stamps. Passed House July 21, 1947.

From Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1380, veteran death gratuities. Passed House June 16, 1947.

H. R. 3394, to provide for return of World War II dead. Passed House June 16, 1947. Passed Senate, amended, July 23, 1947.

H. R. 1544, providing Gold Star lapel buttons to widows, parents, and next of kin of veterans who lost their lives. Passed House July 21, 1947.

H. R. 4017, cashing of terminal-leave bonds. Passed House July 7, 1947. Passed Senate July 19, 1947.

H. R. 2314, expedites lump-sum payments under Naval Aviation Cadet Act to survivors of deceased officers. Passed House June 16, 1947. Passed Senate July 16, 1947.

From Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 4059, providing for homesteading in Alaska for veterans. Passed House July 21, 1947.

From Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 2780—S. 854, Public Law 85, emergency veterans' housing—$35,500,000 authorization.

H. R. 3203, Public Law 129, provides among other things priorities for veterans and families in connection with housing material.

H. R. 3492, war housing disposal—permanent buildings—provides for veteran priority and financing of purchase under National Housing Act. Passed House June 18, 1947.

H. R. 3448, amends Federal Home Loan Bank Act to permit banks to accept 25-year mortgages, which is the maturity period of many veteran home loans. Passed House June 2, 1947. Passed Senate July 23, 1947.

From the Appropriations Committee:

H. R. 4031, Public Law 161, providing for expenditures after July 1, 1947, for amputees.

From Ways and Means Committee:

H. R. 479, provides for refund of income taxes paid for year in which serviceman died while in service. Passed House July 22, 1947.

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

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman read from the President's message, then he began reading a list of great acts this Congress had passed in the interest of the veterans. May I ask the gentleman if the President has vetoed any of those bills?

Mr. HALLECK. No; he has not.

Mr. RAYBURN. In all probability if the House under its present leadership would follow the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and pass some more good laws with reference to the veterans, in all probability the President would not veto those?

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the minority leader, as I have said in my statement, the opposition of the President is expressed through the Bureau of the Budget, and it has been expressed to most of these measures. Now, then, in connection with the cashing of the terminal-leave-pay bonds, as I pointed out in the debate on that measure, the officials from the Treasury Department testified and appeared in opposition. That measure is now at the White House. I could not undertake to say whether the President will veto that measure or not.

Mr. RAYBURN. The thing about it is that the representatives of the Treasury and the administration in all probability appeared before the committee in opposition to some form of payment, but did they appear in opposition to the bill as it passed the House? Does the gentleman's memory go back and can he say definitely that that is the fact?

Mr. HALLECK. I can say with all reasonable assurance that that is the fact. With respect to the cashing of the terminal-leave bonds there was at one time a substitute proposal suggested which would have simply made them negotiable. My information is that the Treasury appeared against the cashing of the bonds, which was the manner in which the legislation was finally passed.

Mr. RAYBURN. It goes without saying, however, that the President has not vetoed any of these measures that the gentleman says this Congress has passed in the interest of the veteran.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentlewoman. The time is entirely in the hands of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I do not have the time right now; I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

REENACT PRICE CONTROL ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed gratified to hear the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] call attention to legislation in the interest of the veterans, all of which was recommended and urged and advocated by the President and nearly unanimously voted by the Democratic Members.

But, unfortunately, such was not the case as to the high cost of living which the President repeatedly has urged be reduced. About that you gentlemen have absolutely failed to do anything. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution today, fully appreciating, I want you to know, that no action will be taken in these closing days of the session, but I am introducing it for the purpose and in the hope that those responsible for the high cost of living may finally yield to the appeals of the President and do something to bring about a reduction in the high cost of living, and at the same time to give

you gentlemen a chance and an opportunity, when you go home, to explain to the people why no action has been taken to reduce the high cost of living, when that action lies in your power.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks the text of the resolution I am now introducing and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Resolution to reestablish effective price and rent control

Whereas notwithstanding the assurances given last year by industrial leaders, manufacturers and building contractors that if price controls were removed and if they were free of what they then termed "unnecessary controls and restrictions affecting free enterprise" that the then-existing high prices would not only be held in check but would be gradually lowered and home construction would increase; and

Whereas since the Office of Price Administration was abolished the prices of all foods and commodities have continuously risen during the past year and the cost of living today is at the highest point in history in the United States; and

Whereas with the end of rent control the cost of living will rise more sharply; and

Whereas despite the report of the Mid-year Economic Report of the President, and the appeal of President Truman to manufacturers, businessmen, and builders to reduce prices, prices have continued to rise; and

Whereas people of low and even medium incomes are obliged to deny themselves of actual necessities of life and are deprived of proper housing accommodations; and

Whereas many economists fear that the continuous increase in prices is certain to create inflation and will eventually force employees to demand higher wages to the endangerment of the peaceful conditions now existing between industry and labor; and

Whereas the stoppage of the dangerous increase in the cost of living can only be accomplished by reestablishing price and rent control: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby vested with all the powers which were conferred on the Price Administrator by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as such act was approved on January 30, 1942. Such powers shall be subject to the same limitations and safeguards as were contained in such act as it was approved on such date, with the exception that the powers vested in the President by this act shall terminate on December 31, 1948.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to establish in the executive branch of the Government such an agency or such agencies as he deems necessary to accomplish the objective of effective price and rent control and home construction. The President is further authorized to delegate to any such agency or agencies or to any other department or agency any or all of the powers vested in him by the first section of this act.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, these avaricious business and industrial czars who are plunging this country toward uncontrolled inflation and risking the soundness of our economy have proved that they have no intention of heeding the President's plea for reducing prices.

COST OF LIVING INDEX STANDS AT 190 PERCENT

On the other hand, prices continue to go up, and this morning the cost of living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics stands above 190 percent of the 1935–39 average.

This means that the cost of living has doubled in less than 8 years.

Most of that increase has occurred since OPA was murdered on the floor of this House 13 months ago.

Price control was repealed in the face of my warnings.

It was repealed in the face of the President's warnings and of his veto message on the first bill presented him.

So now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the only thing we can do is to reinstate price control.

It is too late to keep prices from rising; but it is not too late to keep them from going higher.

There is still time to prevent the absolute prostration of such an inflation panic as has created chaos and anarchy in China.

There is still time to save private enterprise from its own folly and suicide.

These big industries, the cartels, and the monopolies and the trust and combines, with their enormous and smooth-running lobbies, are continuing to roll up huge profits, enormous reserves, and surpluses, and they are sitting on top of the world.

But the world is made up of consumers, and the weight of those unconscionable profiteers is crushing the people.

ONE 1939 DOLLAR BUYS TWO 1947 DOLLARS

It takes two 1947 dollars to buy what one 1939 dollar bought.

At the rate we are going it will not be long before it will take three 1947 dollars to buy what $1 would get in 1939.

Now is the time to prevent that wild and uncontrolled inflation which is bound to result if the inflationary panic ever gets started.

Now is the time to put on the brakes. Now is the time to reenact the price-control laws.

So, as I stated, I have today filed a joint resolution which empowers the President to exercise any or all of the powers we gave to President Roosevelt in 1942 under the Price Control Act. We have faith and trust in President Truman, and we know that he will use those powers with great discretion.

I know that many of you here on this floor are serving your first term. You do not and cannot remember the recurrent debates on wartime controls.

But I know, too, that all of you can remember what took place when the President declared the existence of a state of emergency and the Nazi war machine began to be heard clear across the ocean.

HOW INFLATION BEGINS

War plants went to work on defense orders. The Army and Navy were enlarged. Everybody was at work, and money was flowing freely. People with money naturally want to spend it, and pretty soon we were beginning to see real shortages in the stores. Then other controls were imposed, and we converted to all-out war. People could spend their money only for food and clothing.

We had to have price controls and rationing to make sure that everybody got his just share. Even so, you remember that timid housewives filled their closets with sugar and canned goods and soap.

The same thing can happen in peace.

Once the panic of fear gets started, it is too late to stop it. When people begin to take their money out of the banks and to demand silver instead of paper, when they begin to buy diamonds instead of bonds, or to hide the money in the mattress, and when they begin to buy huge stocks of all scarce items—canned goods, sugar, and other things that will keep—you know the palsy of fear is settling over the land.

We dare not wait, Mr. Speaker.

Now is the time to act.

We cannot depend on "private enterprise."

THE LITTLE MAN IS SQUEEZED

I am not criticizing legitimate business. I have been in business all my life. I like to make a profit as well as you or anybody else.

But today the big interests are not making a legitimate and reasonable profit. They are making exorbitant profits, and the little man is being squeezed.

The people who are being hurt by these soaring prices are the workers, the housewives, the farmers, the small-salaried white-collar workers, the annuitants and insurance beneficiaries with small fixed income, the small retailers, the patriotic people who bought Government bonds and held onto them, the taxpayers.

The big boys are getting theirs. As the GI's used to say, they never had it so good.

But while they are getting theirs on a constantly rising market, they are hurting the best interests of our country. They are sacrificing our future economic security and stability to immediate and inordinate profits.

More than once, when I have observed the big companies flouting the law and getting black-market prices for lumber and meat and building materials through side payments and tie-in sales and other such devices for evading the law, if not breaking it, I have urged the Department of Justice to proceed against them under the antitrust laws or any other applicable statutes, and I am glad to say that it was possible to break up some of those profiteering rackets, but unfortunately not very many.

ACTION IS NECESSARY

I also demanded action against the packers who have so brazenly defied the Nation, and who went on strike to keep the country meatless until price ceilings were removed. Over a year ago I introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of the American Meat Institute and of the packing industry. Repeatedly I brought to the attention of the House proof that the packers' warehouses were bulging with meat and meat products, and that their own feeding pens, in close proximity to their slaughterhouses, were filled with beef stock and hogs.

When the ceilings were removed this meat flowed onto the retail market in a high-priced stampede at double the cost to the consumer.

Everything jumped in price—vegetables, canned goods, shortening, fresh fruit, bread.

They are still going up. We dare not wait any longer.

The President's appeals have been ignored by big business, as have the warnings of the President's economic advisers and of many of the outstanding economists of private industry.

As I told you, I have no hope of action on this resolution prior to adjournment. I do have hope that it will make our businessmen pause and think and give heed to the President's repeated requests and warnings. If they do not, then at the special session if one is called, or in the early days of the next session, I shall demand action—and what is more important to you on the left, the people will demand action.

Mr. Speaker, while I have the floor I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the floor yesterday, and at the same time ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the other day we took care of the Japanese who were interned by us on the west coast by authorizing the Attorney General to entertain suits for damages in the amount of $2,500. We are now entertaining the claims of the Filipinos pursuant to the $400,000,000 which we advanced to them. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce several weeks ago reported out the bill H. R. 4044, which will do the thing we are really interested in, namely, taking care of our own people who were internees in Santo Tomas and elsewhere, and making provision for those who suffered the Death March of Bataan. I hope and trust that before this session ends, after we have taken care of everybody else in the world, we will stand up and take care of our own people when that bill is brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, you have before you this afternoon a bill which is designed to do more than the bill you passed a year ago to help take care of the Filipinos. You have given the Filipinos $400,000,000 to take care of the things that happened over there during the war, and to pay for the damages that were suffered. As was said a moment ago, if an American had his house destroyed in the last war, unless he had war-damage insurance he would have gotten nothing for it, but you are going over to the Philippines and offer to settle all the claims there, and pay everybody, as nearly as you can, out of the amount we have authorized to be appropriated, $400,000,000.

This bill comes from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That committee has recommended that we pay to foreign countries millions and millions and millions of dollars. You are not through. That committee is going to bring in many more bills asking you to pay hundreds of millions and hundreds of millions more to foreign countries. Where are you going to get the money? I have asked that thousands of times in this House, and you have not been able to answer.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In the bill I referred to a moment ago, H. R. 4044, we cover into the Treasury of the United States $250,000,000 to $275,000,000 of German and Japanese vested assets in the United States.

Mr. RICH. We ought to get that money. That is the only thing we are going to get from Germany for fighting the last war. We are not after anything; we would just like a little justice. I should like to have a little justice for the American people. You have passed this bill for $400,000,000. Last year you gave the War Damage Commission $4,000,000 to go over there and settle these claims. If anybody here thinks $4,000,000 is not a lot of money, then I do not know anything about finance. I think $4,000,000 is a lot of money in any man's language, especially the language of the United States of America, but the way we have been talking in the last 5 or 6 years it is only a pea in a pod.

Before they get started they come in here and want to boost this sum to $8,400,000. They have not even got started. The bureaucrats, the rascals, have been asking us for money for the last 6 or 8 or 10 years and you have been giving it to them like drunken sailors. You have been passing out money as if it did not mean anything. Remember that the taxpayers of this country have to pay the bill. They want $4,000,000 to go over there and start these claims. The claims will not be in here for 2 or 3 months. Then if they go over there and try to aggregate the claims for the different amounts, that will take them 3 or 4 months. Why not wait until next year before you pass this legislation, and see just the number of claims you are going to have and how difficult it will be to adjudicate the claims. You can do it more intelligently. You can do it more wisely and you can do it to the best advantage of the taxpayers of America, and you will not be asked by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to increase the amount from $400,000,000 to about a billion dollars or $1,500,000,000. If you want more time I think you can get a little more time to do it after you have spent 5 years on it, and you can do it in a wise and judicious manner.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. DORN. Would not the gentleman be more correct if, in speaking of money being sent to Europe, he said billions of dollars instead of millions of dollars?

Mr. RICH. Well, I want to talk in a language that I think most of the Members of Congress understand. They have been talking in the billions so long that I am not very sure whether they know what they are talking about.

Think of this organization, this bureaucratic bunch that is starting over there. They want to double the amount or take two or three times the amount. You do not need them to go there. I will tell you that a lot of them would never go there and settle claims if I were running this Government. They ought to be sent some place else and given a job because I question whether any of them know what it is all about. You could get some Filipinos who are educated and who have been educated in the American schools and who live in the Philippines and who could do it for one-fourth or one-fifth of what it is going to cost us to do it.

Members of Congress, do you believe that we should build up this great organization here to go over and settle these claims now? That is the only reason I am trying to fight this bill. We are going to have a roll-call vote on this bill, and I do not want the majority leader to come over to find out how you are going to vote once you get a quorum here, and you might as well know that right now. I want to know how many fellows want to handle this in the right, the wise, the sensible, and judicious way or whether we are going to give these bureaucrats all they want. They had $4,000,000,000, and they only spent a couple of hundred thousand dollars. Now, they want to double the money. Do you not think it is time for us to stop that? Let us stop them here, and let us do a good job.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am always glad to stand alongside my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] in the interest of economy.

We on the Committee on Foreign Affairs were asked for $16,000,000 for administrative expenses for the Philippine War Damage Commission. I know that as one of BOB RICH'S younger and newer members of the Pennsylvania delegation I was fighting for economy and, in fact, waged a battle to get this reduced from $16,000,000 to $8,400,000.

The reason was that the Navy went over there and handled their war damage claims, but the Navy's administration expenses were 1.8 percent instead of the 4 percent this Commission claimed to be necessary. There were certain items that the peacetime Philippine War Damage Commission felt they would have in their budget that the Navy did not. Both the chairman [Mr. WARING] and I separately estimated that amount at seven-tenths of 1 percent. So on that basis of computing administration expenses the amount would run between $8,000,000 and $10,000,000.

I oppose loose spending and therefore I do not think it would be unjust to say that an analogy to insurance claims is entirely out of order here, as these claims handled by large adjustment agencies are not comparable in the least.

If I understood the former chairman of the Interior Affairs Committee correctly, he said it might cost $100,000,000 in the Philippines. If that is what he meant to say, that would be a gross waste of money. I do not think the expense of

this Commission during the 1948 fiscal year should run more than $2,000,000.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I just want to correct the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BELL. I did not say it would cost $100,000,000 to administer this matter. What I said was that if you did not give them a reasonable amount to administer it intelligently, we would probably lose $100,000,000.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

Now, may I explain the finances of the Commission for a minute? At the present time the Commission has a $4,000,000 authorization for administration expense to take them through until 1951. They have spent during the fiscal year 1947, $800,000 of it. They have just been appropriated this year, by conference on appropriations, $2,000,000. So that they have spent to date $2,800,000 out of the $4,000,000. The Foreign Affairs Committee is asking you to give them a final figure of $8,400,000 over this 4-year period to 1951.

The other body passed this bill in 5 minutes, and they gave them $16,000,000, all that this Philippine War Damage Commission asked for. Then, when the Chairman of the Commission was cross-examined in our Foreign Affairs Committee, he admitted they had $2,000,000 that they did not have budgeted. They wanted that as a cushion. So that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House has cut this bill $7,600,000 so far, and we are watching the purse strings.

May I finish by pointing out some committee amendments that I have put in. The first amendment is to prevent the paying of any of this money in damage claims to anybody in the Philippines who is a member of the Communist Party or advancing those particular ideas that do not accord with the democratic system. That is only fair.

The other amendment is to scan the Board itself to see that everybody on it is checked by the FBI before January 1, 1948, so that we know we have loyal citizens on this Commission.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I, too, as a member of the committee, was interested in achieving economies, and I think the gentleman from Minnesota was also interested in economy. I think there were quite a few members of the committee interested in economy.

Mr. FULTON. May I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] our chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], especially for being interested in economy. The membership of the Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously agreed on the reduced figure for administration expenses after extensive hearings.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, to get back to the bill under consideration, I want to remind the House that this bill does not appropriate or authorize a single additional dollar. It provides that out of the $400,000,000 already authorized for rehabilitation work in the Philippines by legislation passed last year, there shall be an increase from 1 percent to 2.1 percent for administrative expenses, that is, from $4,000,000 to $8,400,000, so that the Commission can do the best possible job in making sure that all claims are properly settled and the money well spent.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this horrible picture that we have heard so much about, Duel in the Sun, is being imposed on the people of Washington again. I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD to show just what it means.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some correspondence between myself and our colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] on the accomplishments of the Un-American Activities Committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a report which I have written for the magazine The Republican.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a report to the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the membership on their generosity which made possible the raising of a large amount of money for the Metropolitan Boys Club of Washington.

First I wish to thank the membership, especially those who participated in playing the baseball game on July 12. Next I wish to report on how we carried out the mandate served by our gracious Speaker and our majority leader on us Republicans to win the ball game, which we did successfully by a score of 16 to 13.

We are grateful for the sportsmanship shown by our colleagues on the Democratic side. I am sure that when our colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE] challenged us to the game he wanted to win it and that he kept his promise of endeavoring to do everything possible to make a great showing for the House in this joint effort to raise money for the Boys Club.

I wish to thank Chief Justice Vinson of the United States Supreme Court for participating with us and tossing out the first ball.

I wish also to compliment our colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] who did such a fine job umpiring for us; our colleague from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] for his efforts on the publicity end; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL], finance, and the gentleman from Wisconsin who handled concessions, the gentleman from California, "Dr." POULSON, who added much to the entertainment of the afternoon, and the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman GILLIE, who so ably administered to the physical needs of the players.

Mr. Speaker, for the interest of the membership I insert at this point a list of the Members who participated in the ball game:

REPUBLICAN TEAM LINE-UP, CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME, JULY 12

CASE, South Dakota, left field.
JACKSON, California, third base.
DAVIS, Wisconsin, shortstop.
FLETCHER, California, right field.
HOWELL, Illinois, first base.
BISHOP, Illinois, second base.
STRATTON, Illinois, center field.
BROPHY, Wisconsin, catcher.
CORBETT, Pennsylvania, pitcher.
BOGGS, Delaware, pitcher.
WILSON, Indiana, pitcher.
HILL, Colorado, pitcher.
BUTLER, New York, pitcher.
MUNDT, South Dakota, pitcher.

Utility: HORAN, Washington; HAGEN, Minnesota; MACKINNON, Minnesota; LANDIS, Indiana; KEARNS, Pennsylvania; LOVE, West Virginia; SCOBLICK, Pennsylvania.

STOCKMAN, Oregon, umpire; MARTIN, Massachusetts, coach; HALLECK, Indiana, coach; SPRINGER, Indiana, coach; PLOESER, Missouri; KEARNEY, New York, publicity; KUNKEL, Pennsylvania, treasurer; BYRNES, Wisconsin, concessions; ARENDS, Illinois, whip.

Score, Democrats, 13; Republicans, 16.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleague from Illinois in thanking those who participated in this ball game to make it a success. I appreciate their efforts very much.

I, too, insert in the RECORD at this point the names of Members who participated on my side:

DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN BASEBALL GAME FOR BENEFIT OF METROPOLITAN POLICE BOYS' CLUB OF WASHINGTON, JULY 12, 1947

1. ABERNETHY, THOMAS G., Mississippi.
2. ALBERT, CARL, Oklahoma.
3. BATTLE, LAURIE C., Alabama.
4. BRYSON, JOSEPH R., South Carolina.
5. CAMP, A. SIDNEY, Georgia.
6. COOLEY, HAROLD D., North Carolina.
7. DURHAM, CARL T., North Carolina.
8. EVINS, JOE L., Tennessee.
9. FOGARTY, JOHN E., Rhode Island.
10. GARY, J. VAUGHAN, Virginia.
11. GORE, ALBERT, Tennessee.
12. GOSSETT, ED, Texas.
13. GRANT, GEORGE M., Alabama.
14. HUBER, WALTER B., Ohio.
15. JACKSON, HENRY M., Washington.
16. JONES, ROBERT E., JR., Alabama.
17. KEFAUVER, ESTES, Tennessee.
18. PRICE, EMORY H., Florida.
19. PRIEST, J. PERCY, Tennessee.

20. RICHARDS, JAMES P., South Carolina.
21. RIVERS, L. MENDEL, South Carolina.
22. SMATHERS, GEORGE A., Florida.
23. STIGLER, WILLIAM G., Oklahoma.
24. WHEELER, W. M. (DON), Georgia.
25. WHITTEN, JAMIE L., Mississippi.
26. WORLEY, EUGENE, Texas.
27. LANHAM, HENDERSON, Georgia.
28. HARDY, PORTER, JR., Virginia.

The page boys.

I would like to give special mention to Fishbait Miller for the fine job he did in helping with the line-up and in various other ways.

I thank all the Members for the effort they put forth for the Boys' Club of Washington. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] will tell us in a minute just how much money was raised.

Mr. COOLEY. How about the umpire?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Yes; a word of thanks to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] who represented us so ably on the field as umpire as he had the difference on the field.

Also I wish to thank the gentleman from Alabama, GEORGE GRANT, who looked after the sale of refreshments on the Democratic side. Also the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] who was the champion peanut salesman. We are grateful to them all.

I think it should be observed at this point in regard to the score which the gentleman from Illinois mentioned which was 16 to 13, but if the rain had not knocked the Democrats out of their last bat it would have been a different story.

Mr. WORLEY. I am sure everyone understands that the score would have been different had we had our last bat.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Naturally the score would have been entirely different. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. It seemed to me that sometime during the game somebody knocked a home run.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Yes. We will not say anything about who was playing center field at the time. You have all heard of "Wrong Way" Corrigan.

Mr. KNUTSON. That home run was an optical illusion.

Mr. ARENDS. Without making it a matter of record, can the gentleman tell us whether or not the ball was ever recovered?

Mr. PRICE of Florida. The ball was found after about 10 or 15 minutes. Of course, Mr. COOLEY made the slight mistake of running toward second base when he should have run for the bleachers.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to let this opportunity pass without thanking the authorities in charge for so freely giving us the use of the Eastern High School facilities to do a little practicing and also for the valuable assistance given to us by Coach Geigon. He helped us very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania very briefly that he may make his financial report.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the net total profit to date is $2,927.03. I just collected $10 since the festivities started. The cash sales were $3,197. That consisted of money paid in for tickets by Members plus $188 which came from the Touchdown Club of Washington, headed by Mr. Robert C. Simmons. This organization participated in the ticket sales to that extent. All of us appreciate their fine cooperation greatly.

The sales at the stadium gate were $329. The net profits from concessions were $119.25, the total receipts being $3,645.25.

We also did a good job for the United States Treasury because the tax on tickets amounted to $596.02. This was by far the largest item of expense.

All the other expenses were very small. The Washington stadium, under the direction of Clark Griffith, not only let us have the stadium free, but also supplied a great many facilities, including the ticket sellers at the windows and numerous other small items which saved a great deal of money and enabled the net profit to be much higher than it otherwise would have been.

It may be we will take in some more money between now and adjournment because on each of the last few days I have received checks from Members who had forgotten to send them in. If any of you have overlooked the letter we will be glad to have you mail your checks this afternoon. They will be added to the check that is being sent to the Metropolitan Boys Club. With the tremendous rush of business on the floor and in committee during the past weeks, inevitably a percentage would overlook this payment.

The complete statement of receipts and expenses is as follows:

Statement of receipts and expenses, congressional baseball game, Griffith Stadium, July 12, 1947

RECEIPTS

Tickets:		
Cash sales		$3,197.00
Griffith Stadium sales		329.00
Total		3,426.00
Profit—concessions at Griffith Stadium		119.25
Total receipts		3,645.25

EXPENSES

Tax on tickets		$596.02
Mimeographing and envelopes		2.80
Printing, 25,000 tickets		61.50
Griffith Stadium expense:		
Scoreboard	$2.00	
Maids	8.00	
Soda, clubhouse	8.40	
3 dozen baseballs, at $16.50 a dozen	49.50	
		67.90
Total expenses		728.22
Profit		2,917.03

Statement prepared July 25, 1947.

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

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats lost but the Republicans were the last to bat. Next year there will be other controversies and conflicts coming on and the Democrats would like to challenge the Republicans to a real game in 1948.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carreli, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4269. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BALL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4269) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. KNUTSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted

by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(but only until July 1, 1948, in the case of paper in rolls of less than 15 inches in width)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT TAFT,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
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 Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Existing law (par. 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930) admits free of duty "standard newsprint paper". The House joint resolution amended this paragraph so as to provide that paper which is in rolls not less than 15 inches in width shall be deemed to be standard newsprint insofar as width of rolls is concerned. Senate amendment No. 1 limits the application of the amendment made by the House to the period ending June 30, 1948; and Senate amendment No. 2, changes the width of the permissible rolls from 15 to 9 inches.

The House recedes on amendment No. 2, and recedes on amendment No. 1, with an amendment the effect of which is to make the 15-inch width permissible as permanent law, but to make the 9-inch width permissible only until July 1, 1948.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the Resolution 238, to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMINATION OF WARTIME TAX PROVISIONS

MR. KNUTSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II, 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 amendment numbered 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, and agree to the same.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT TAFT,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
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 Senate to the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill provided that for the purposes of the proviso of section 511 (h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, the present war shall be considered as having terminated on the fifteenth day after the date of the enactment of the bill. The Senate amendment provides that for such purposes the present war shall be considered as having terminated on March 31, 1948. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: The House bill amended section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to terminate on December 31, 1947, the income-tax exclusion of $1,500 of service pay now allowed to commissioned officers or commissioned warrant officers serving in the armed forces of the United States and to citizens or residents of the United States serving in the armed forces of any of the other United Nations. The Senate amendment provides that such income-tax exclusion shall not terminate until December 31, 1948. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: The House bill amended section 22 (b) (13) of the code so as to terminate on December 31, 1947, the income-tax exclusion of all service pay allowed under existing law to personnel serving in the armed forces of the United States below the grade of commissioned officer (or commissioned warrant officer). The Senate amendment provides that such income-tax exclusion shall not terminate until December 31, 1948. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: The House bill amended section 22 (d) (6) (A) of the code which makes special provisions, in the case of taxpayers using the last-in first-out method for income-tax reporting, for replacement of inventories depleted by involuntary liquidation because of circumstances related to the war. Section 8 of the House bill provided that the relief under section 22 (d) (6) (A) of the code is allowable if the involuntary liquidation occurred in a taxable year beginning prior to August 1, 1947 (instead of prior to the termination of the war), and the replacement occurred in a taxable year ending prior to August 1, 1950 (instead of not more than three years after the termination of the war). Amendment No. 4 substitutes for the date August 1, 1947, the date January 1, 1948; and amendment No. 5 substitutes for the date August 1, 1950, the date January 1, 1951. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 6: The House bill amended section 1621 (a) of the code by striking out paragraph (1) thereof which excludes from the definition of wages, and hence from withholding of income tax at source, remuneration for services performed as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States. The House bill provided that the amendment striking out paragraph (1) should be applicable with respect to wages paid on or after January 1, 1948. The Senate amendment provides that such amendment shall be applicable with respect to wages paid on or after January 1, 1949. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 7: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 9: This is a clerical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 10: This amendment provides for percentage depletion at the rate of 15 percent in the case of bauxite for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: This amendment provides for percentage depletion at the rate of 15 percent in the case of pyrophyllite for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: This amendment provides for percentage depletion at the rate of 15 percent in the case of phosphate rock for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 13: This amendment provides for percentage depletion at the rate of 15 percent in the case of trona for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 14: This amendment provides, with respect to percentage depletion, that "In the case of potash and thenardite, whether extracted from a mine or from a brine or other deposit, there shall be included in gross and net income from the property the income from other minerals or mineral salts extracted therefrom." The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 15: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 16: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 17: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 18: This is a technical amendment and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 19: The Senate amendment adds a section 16 to the bill, for which there is no corresponding provision in the bill as passed by the House. Section 23 (q) (2) of the code provides that contributions or gifts (for religious, charitable, educational, etc., purposes) made by a corporation to an unincorporated association (trust, chest, fund, or foundation) are not deductible if made within a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1946 (the date of cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President) unless such contributions or gifts are to be used within the United States or any of its possessions. The Senate amendment adding section 16 to the bill amends section 23 (q) (2) so that the requirement that such gifts or contributions must be used within the United States or any of its possessions is applicable only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948, instead of December 31, 1946, as provided under existing law. The House recedes.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4069) to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. COOPER (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous conference report signed by all of the conferees. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the chairman of our committee make an explanation to the House of the action of the conferees. I think it is important enough to do that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I understood we finally disposed of the matter. I think the gentleman has reference to the $1,500 exemption for servicemen, is that correct?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. We accepted the Senate amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As I understand, as the measure left the House, the exemptions that the armed services personnel held since 1943 were removed. It was provided in the 1943 act that no enlisted man would be charged an individual income tax on any pay received, and the armed services personnel and commissioned class were entitled to a $1,500 exemption. As it left the House, this exemption was removed; is that correct?

Mr. KNUTSON. Not as far as the enlisted personnel was concerned. It only was removed from the officer personnel. The Senate restored the officer personnel, and that amendment was accepted in conference.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I believe the chairman will agree with me that the position taken by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania was the position adopted by the Senate on this bill, and that provision was agreed to in conference.

Mr. KNUTSON. The will of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania prevailed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just thought it would be interesting to the House to know that the armed services personnel will still have the same exemptions as they have been enjoying for the past four or five years.

Mr. KNUTSON. They will continue to enjoy a favored status over all other citizens.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That exemption will continue through 1948?

Mr. KNUTSON. To 1949.

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. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a summary of the history of the Committee on Ways and Means during this session of the Congress.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bills H. R. 2659 and 2173 may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on those bills.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill H. R. 3045 may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

RETURNS OF ITALIAN PROPERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to provide for returns of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas article 79 of the Treaty of Peace with Italy, signed at Paris on February 10, 1947, grants to the Allied and Associated Powers the right to seize and retain "all property rights and interests which on the coming into force of the present treaty are within its territory and belong to Italy or to Italian nationals, and to apply such property or the proceeds thereof to such purposes as it may desire, within the limits of its claims and those of its nationals against Italy or Italian nationals, including debts, other than claims fully satisfied under other articles of the present treaty" and further provides that "All Italian property, or the proceeds thereof, in excess of the amount of such claims, shall be returned"; and

Whereas pursuant to article 79 of the treaty of peace, negotiations have been entered into between the Governments of the United States and of Italy looking toward an agreement under which, upon the return of property, formerly Italian, in the United States, Italy will place at the disposal of the United States funds to be used in meeting certain claims of nationals of the United States; and

Whereas for the purpose of carrying out such agreement, it is desirable to authorize in accordance with the procedures provided for in section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, return to Italy or citizens or subjects of Italy, or corporations or associations organized under the laws of Italy, of property vested in or transferred to the United States or its agencies; and

Whereas for the purpose of aiding the revival of the Italian economy and establishing it on a self-sustaining basis, it is desirable that there be returned or transferred to Italy those Italian vessels acquired by the United States after December 7, 1941, for use in the war effort and now owned by the United States and vessels of a total tonnage approximately equal to the tonnage of those Italian vessels seized by the United States after September 1, 1939, and lost while being employed in the United States war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President, or such officer or agency as he may designate, is hereby authorized to return, in accordance with the procedures provided for in section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, any property or interest, or the net proceeds thereof, which has been, since December 18, 1941, vested in or transferred to any officer or agency of the United States pursuant to the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and which immediately prior to such vesting or transfer was the property or interest of Italy or a citizen or subject of Italy, or a corporation or association organized under the laws of Italy.

SEC. 2. Section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(2) that such owner, and legal representative or successor in interest, if any, are not—

"(A) the Government of Germany, Japan, Bulgaria, Hungary, or Rumania; or

"(B) a corporation or association organized under the laws of such nation: *Provided*, That any property or interest or proceeds which, but for the provisions of this subdivision (B), might be returned under this section to any such corporation or association, may be returned to the owner or owners of all the stock of such corporation or of all the proprietary and beneficial interest in such association, if their ownership of such stock or proprietary and beneficial interest existed immediately prior to vesting in or transfer to the Alien Property Custodian and continuously thereafter to the date of such return (without regard to purported divestments or limitations of such ownership by any government referred to in subdivision (A) hereof) and if such ownership was by one or more citizens of the United States or by one or more corporations organized under the laws of the United States or any State, Territory, or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That such owner or owners shall succeed to those obligations limited in aggregate amount to the value of such property or interest or proceeds, which are lawfully assertible against the corporation or association by persons not ineligible to receive a return under this section; or

"(C) an individual voluntarily resident at any time since December 7, 1941, within the territory of such nation, other than a citizen of the United States or a diplomatic or consular officer of Italy or of any nation with which the United States has not at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war: *Provided*, That an individual who, while in the territory of a nation with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war, was deprived of life or substantially deprived of liberty pursuant to any law, degree, or regulation of such nation discriminating against political, racial, or religious groups, shall not be deemed to have voluntarily resided in such territory; or

"(D) an individual who was at any time after December 7, 1941, a citizen or subject of Germany, Japan, Bulgaria, Hungary, or Rumania, and who on or after December 7,

1941, and prior to the date of the enactment of this section, was present (other than in the service of the United States) in the territory of such nation or in any territory occupied by the military or naval forces thereof or engaged in any business in any such territory: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (D) return may be made to an individual who, as a consequence of any law, decree, or regulation of the nation of which he was then a citizen or subject, discriminating against political, racial, or religious groups, has at no time between December 7, 1941, and the time when such law, decree, or regulation was abrogated, enjoyed full rights of citizenship under the law of such nation; or

"(E) a foreign corporation or association which at any time after December 7, 1941, was controlled or 50 percent or more of the stock of which was owned by any person or persons ineligible to receive a return under subdivisions (A), (B), (C), or (D) hereof: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (e), return may be made to a corporation or association so controlled or owned, if such corporation or association was organized under the laws of a nation any of whose territory was occupied by the military or naval forces of any nation with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war, and if such control or ownership arose after March 1, 1938, as an incident to such occupation and was terminated prior to the enactment of this section; and"

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 33. No return may be made pursuant to section 9 (a) or 32 (a) unless notice of claim for return has been filed within 2 years from the seizure or vesting in the Alien Property Custodian, as the case may be, of the property or interest in respect of which the claim is made or by August 8, 1948, or in the cases of claims pursuant to section 32 (a) by Italy, citizens or subjects of Italy, or corporations or associations organized under the laws of Italy, by July 31, 1949, whichever is later."

SEC. 4. The President is authorized upon such terms as he deems necessary (a) to transfer to the Government of Italy all vessels which were under Italian registry and flag on September 1, 1939, and were thereafter acquired by the United States and are now owned by the United States; and (b) with respect to any vessel under Italian registry and flag on September 1, 1939, and subsequently seized in United States ports and thereafter lost while being employed in the United States war effort, to transfer to the Government of Italy surplus merchant vessels of the United States of a total tonnage approximately equal to the total tonnage of the Italian vessels lost: *Provided*, That no monetary compensation shall be paid either for the use by the United States or its agencies of former Italian vessels so acquired or seized or for the return or transfer of such vessels or substitute vessels.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RICH. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. RICH. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation requires no appropriation at all. It is a significant step toward the rehabilitation of a country which is undergoing grave difficulties, the repercussions of which are of vital concern to this country. We must do all that we can to bolster this Nation and help her to remain a bastion of liberty rather than an outpost of communism.

This is not only a matter of our own national self-interest, it is in the interest of world peace. Moreover, it is in line with the policy we adopted following the surrender of Fascist Italy on September 8, 1943, when we granted Italy cobelligerent status and guaranteed the essential nationhood of that country. This legislation will help to relieve the burden imposed by the Italian treaty recently ratified.

The headlong rapidity of events in Europe, the withdrawal of the Russian Government from participation in the Paris Conference, the large-scale attacks on war-ravaged and destitute Greece, and other disturbing manifestations of Soviet expansionism, make it urgent that we do all that we can to give assistance to Italy at this critical time. It is known that there are strong, violent elements in the Communist Party in Italy and they have ample means for fomenting serious disturbances which might well result in the capture by armed force of the Italian Government.

Accordingly, the passage of this resolution is urgent, aside from the material aid it will bring to Italy. It is important also as a further gesture of our determination to resist the antifreedom imperialism which has its headquarters in Moscow.

In addition, this legislation has been recommended most eloquently by our distinguished Secretary of State, who regards it as a very important and vital matter in the conduct of the foreign policy of our country.

Now I should like to say a few words with respect to the safeguarding of the rights and claims of American citizens who may have been injured or whose property may have been damaged as a result of the war with Italy. As you may know, since the Paris Peace Conference it has been the policy of this Government to effectuate as soon as possible the return to Italy of Italian properties in the United States which can be retained under the provisions of article 79 of the Treaty of Peace with Italy. As a matter of fact, the reparations demanded of Italy during the Paris Peace Conference were some $22,000,000,000, and we were accused of wanting to keep Italian property in the United States in order to obtain reparations from Italy. Accordingly, in order to obtain this reduction, first from $22,000,000,000 to $750,000,000, and finally down to $360,000,000, we said at Paris that we would not regard Italian property in this country as a reparations payment to us. The burden of reparations on Italy is a burden which inevitably falls to some extent on us, and, therefore, this was a very wise thing to have done. The national interest was served in this reduction of reparations payments.

In view of the fact that our Government has generously waived its claims under section 79 of the treaty it is appropriate to inquire if the claims of American nationals are adequately protected.

First, let us consider the claims of American nationals with respect to properties in Italy which may have been confiscated or damaged by wartime action. These claims are safeguarded by article 78 of the Peace Treaty which provides, first, that all property rights and interests of American citizens in Italy must be restored to their owners free of all encumbrances and charges, and, second, that the Italian Government is responsible for such restoration in good order or for compensation in Italian lira to the extent of two-thirds of the sum necessary to repair the damage. With respect to this category of claims, the Italian Government has confirmed these obligations by an exchange of letters and, of course, there is an agreement covering this matter which will be signed very soon and the substance of which has already been agreed to.

Then, there are claims of American civilians for personal injuries, and maltreatment of prisoners of war in Italy. As to this no claims have been received. The agreement which is being negotiated provides for $5,000,000 to cover all claims. The indications are that this sum will be more than twice the amount necessary to cover the claims. More than 2 years have elapsed sinve VE-day and the amount of claims already received after due publicity in the Federal Register indicates that $5,000,000 will be ample to cover the claims of American nationals.

With respect to claims of American oil companies in Italy whose factories and plants in Italy have been seriously damaged, further agreements have been made so that they will be satisfied.

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

I understand that United States oil companies have had their property restored, is that right?

Mr. LODGE. I am interested to have this information.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is my understanding.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. It is my understanding that the oil companies have had their property returned to them.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Returned to them.

Mr. HARRIS. It is my understanding that it was their own property that was returned to them and they have their own property back that was taken from them.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad to have that contribution.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is the information I have, that the property has been returned to the oil companies.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the gentleman.

Aside from this question of claims, there is this vital matter with respect to the ships which are to be transferred under this act. The tonnage lost is estimated to be approximately 140,000 tons. To this tonnage should be added 60,000 to 70,000 tons, representing ships previously confiscated and still afloat, which will be returned to Italy by this legisla-

tion. In this category are included five Italian ships confiscated by Latin-American countries, which were purchased by the United States, which served their purpose and which are now idle.

With respect to the Liberty ships to be transferred, it should be noted that there are some 400 or 500 Liberty ships which are now laid up and which have an estimated scrap value of $10,000 to $50,000 per ship. Each of those ships would require from $50,000 to $200,000 in the way of repairs, in order to put them in satisfactory operating order. But it is contemplated that those ships will be transferred to Italy on an "as is—where is" basis. Those ships will be selected by the President of the United States in consulation with the maritime commission. In this way it is hoped that only the better available ships will be transferred.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I would like to ask my colleague, regarding the transfer of the Liberty ships to Italy, if the Maritime Commission has approved the transfer of those ships. The reason I ask that question is that I know certain other countries are anxious to obtain Liberty ships and I understand, whether I am informed correctly or not, there is trouble in getting the maritime commission to authorize the transfer to other countries.

Mr. LODGE. I am informed by the State Department that that matter has been taken care of. In fact, this entire matter has been cleared with the Alien Property Custodian, as well as the Treasury Department.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Would the gentleman tell the House whether Italy, under the peace treaty, is obligated to make reparation payments to other countries?

Mr. LODGE. Under the peace treaty Italy is obligated to make reparation payments to other countries, but those payments are made in the following fashion——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Russia, for instance, will ship in raw materials to Italy, and Italian labor will transform those raw materials into finished products, which will be shipped out to Russia. It involves no expenditure of raw materials on the part of Italy.

Mr. BUCK. Then, conceivably, some of this fund can go to other countries?

Mr. LODGE. This fund cannot go to Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, or Rumania, if those countries are successors in ownership. There are provisions in the bill which cover that entire situation. With respect to reparations, the situation is as I have described.

There are between 15 and 18 Liberty ships involved in this transfer. We have eight additional ships in our possession which we are going to transfer. There are, as I have said, also five ships which we purchased from Brazil and Venezuela.

It should be pointed out that at the end of the war the Italian merchant marine was left with one-tenth of its prewar tonnage. That is to say, 300,000 tons instead of 3,000,000 tons, and many of those losses were sustained during the period of cobelligerency with the United Nations. Furthermore, a number of Italian ships were operated by the Allied forces during this period, thereby causing the Italian Government considerable sacrifice in connection with their operations.

Examples of these are the ships *Vulcania* and *Saturnia* which were used as hospital ships. It is estimated that the Italian economy on the basis of the present exchange situation will make a net currency profit of $15,000,000 per annum if these ships are transferred to her; and if not it will cost them $21,000,000 per annum. Accordingly, a net gain of $36,000,000 is involved.

We recently passed a bill which gave Italy $130,000,000 in relief We know how costly it is to transport that relief overseas. We know that the great difficulty in Italy is lack of foreign exchange. This will put Italy in a position where she can gain some much needed foreign exchange.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that this legislation will receive favorable action at this time. I regard it as of the utmost importance.

The question as to whether the return of Italian vested property to the former Italian owners will jeopardize American claimants has been one which I have gone into thoroughly. It is possible to break down American claimants into three major categories: First, Americans who have claims against Italy because of damage to the property in Italy or Italian control of these Americans either as a result of war activities or arising out of the controls imposed by the Italian Government during its period of belligerency against us; second, claims of Americans directly against the property which is to be returned or claims which they may have against the Italian owners of the property to be returned; and, third, special claims of Americans against Italy arising out of the war and which are not otherwise satisfied under the terms of the treaty of peace which has been ratified by the Senate.

A thorough examination of this Government's policy with respect to these three categories of claims reveals that the present legislation will not jeopardize the claimants' position or the means which they may have to satisfy their claims. I have considered it necessary to go into these questions with the appropriate Government agencies—State, Justice, Treasury—in order that I could be certain that by taking this action we will not be injuring the rights of our nationals. I am firmly convinced that the results of my investigations fully substantiate the conclusion that the enactment of this legislation will not prejudice the rights or claims of those Americans.

With respect to the first type of claims, article 78 of the Treaty of Peace with Italy requires the Italian Government to restore all property rights and interests held by nationals of the United States to such nationals. It further requires that the property shall be returned to complete good order, or if that is not possible, that compensation shall be paid for that part of the property which cannot be returned in complete good order. Using this provision as a basis, the Department of State, in conjunction with other interested agencies, is currently negotiating an agreement with the Italian Government which further insures that the property of American nationals will be returned in good order, or in the event that the property has been so damaged that that is not possible, compensation will be paid. In this connection difficult cases which have arisen over the past 2 years with respect to the return of property in Italy of American nationals in Italy, have been reviewed and full agreement has been reached satisfactory not only to our Government but to the nationals concerned which will make possible the immediate return of such property and the immediate payment of compensation, if such is required. In other words, the American national who owns property in Italy will, in the immediate future, either receive that property back in complete good order and free of all encumbrances which may have been placed upon it while it was under the control of the Italian Government, or in the event that the property cannot be restored to complete good order, he will immediately in the future receive compensation. The fact that the American nationals who have interests in Italy falling into this category are fully satisfied with the terms of the agreement that is being worked out, is sufficient answer to any doubts that may be raised that we are jeopardizing the rights of those Americans by returning Italian vested property.

The second category of claims deals with the claims of American nationals which lie directly against the property which is to be returned or claims against the Italian owners of the property to be returned. The present legislation in and of itself assures that the claims of these American nationals will not be prejudiced. This is necessarily so because the present legislation in every detail uses the same procedures for returning to Italy and Italian nationals their vested properties as this Congress has already deemed satisfactory for the return to other nations and their nationals. This means, therefore, that before vested property can be returned to the Italian owners the Office of Alien Property of the Department of Justice must publish notice in the Federal Register that such property is being returned and must give notice to the claimants that they may pursue their usual legal remedies by attachment or otherwise against that property in order that they may be assured that their claim or claims which are deemed legitimate by our courts will be satisfied. Therefore, these American nationals are in no different position than they would have been if the Italian property had never been vested, with one exception. That exception is that had the property never been vested they might

never have had the opportunity of knowing that the property was in this country, and therefore might never have had the opportunity to attach the property. However, they are now giving formal notice as required by the Congress that the property is in this country and that in the near future it is to be returned to the Italian owners. Therefore, section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended by this legislation, if anything, puts these claimants in a better position, since they have a more adequate opportunity of pursuing their claims against the Italian owners. Under these circumstances there certainly can be no question that the enactment of the present legislation would jeopardize the claims of American nationals falling into this category.

The third category of the claims which may be held by American nationals deals with the special meritorious claims arising out of the war and not otherwise covered by the treaty of peace. With respect to this category, we are talking primarily of the small number of claims for injuries to American civilians in Italy arising out of the war or claims for maltreatment of Americans while prisoners of war of the Italian armed forces. I say "small number" for clear and obvious reasons: First. The Italian authorities never pursued, as did Germany and Japan, a policy of maltreating our American prisoners of war. It is well-known that the Italian armed forces to the fullest extent possible followed the rules of international law with respect to the treatment of their prisoners of war; it is very well-known that they never stooped to the inhumane policy of the Germans of maltreating prisoners of war. That this is so is borne out by the fact that no claims have been filed for such maltreatment. The same applies with respect to American civilians who may have been injured or killed in Italy during the war. During the war the Italians allowed American civilians to pursue their usual course of life in Italy. Those who were under suspicion or against whom there was evidence of working for the Americans against Italy were, in accordance with the usual rules of international law and in the same manner as this Government acted, interned by the Italian Government. The treatment they received, however, as internees was consistent and in accordance with the principles of international law. Moreover, these cases were few in number. Therefore, the type of claim that might arise in this category would be the claim of an American who may have been injured by actual warfare in Italy. In view of the fact that the number of Americans in Italy during the war were few and in view of the fact that to date no claim has been filed in this category, it is clear that we need not fear any large number of such claims.

I wish to stress this last point. Considerable publicity was given in the United States to the negotiations at the Paris Peace Conference. The United States press was full of reports that we were in fact determining at the Paris conference what should be done with respect to claims against Italy. Similarly, such publicity was given to the deliberations of the Senate over the ratification of the Italian Treaty of Peace. Once again the United States press carried full reports concerning the terms of the treaty: the fact that the treaty laid down the rules for satisfying the claims of Americans against Italy. Considerable publicity was given—and is still being given—to the fact that there is now in the United States an economic and financial mission which is negotiating with our Government an executive agreement to settle issues which remain outstanding under the terms of the Treaty of Peace with Italy. The press of the United States has carried numerous reports on these negotiations, but despite all this publicity, I am informed that no large number of claims of any important monetary value have been filed with our Government. We can easily compare this experience with the experience we have had in other cases. When the Yugoslav Government sent a delegation to the United States to work out an agreement on similar questions, a large and considerable number of Americans notified their Government of claims they held against Yugoslavia. The American is quick to realize the possibility of satisfying his claims and making his claims known to the Government. This, therefore, means that in order to satisfy such claims, which are in the category of claims not settled by the treaty of peace, only a very small amount of money is required. On the basis of this evidence, I would be willing to say that anywhere from one to $3,000,000 would be adequate. However, in order to make assurance doubly sure, our Government is requiring in these current negotiations with the Italians the payment by Italy to the United States in the immediate future, of $5,000,000 in American currency which is to be utilized for the satisfaction of these special claims. Under these circumstances there can be no doubt that this amount is more than adequate, and this is a lump sum payment and the entire amount is made available to us. This procedure affords clear advantages to the American national who, if he has such a claim, does not, as is the usual rule under mixed claims commissions and the like, have to satisfy both the foreign government and this Government as to the merits of his claim. He need only deal with this Government and need only present his evidence to this Government, and upon its being satisfied that his claim is a meritorious claim, the money is ready and available for payment to him. The Government of Italy has nothing to say about it. Therefore, I believe it is clear that the enactment of this resolution will not in any way jeopardize the possibilities of the American national who holds such claims against Italy in obtaining satisfaction; on the contrary, under the executive agreement now being worked out, his ability to effect satisfaction of that type of claim will be enhanced. At this point I should like to point out that although this agreement has not been formally signed, the Italian Government has already given its approval to it. The signature is only a matter of typing up the final documents.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summarizing, therefore, the effect of this legislation upon all the possible claims that American nationals might have against Italy or the Italian owners of property in this country, we can say the following:

First. Under the terms of the Treaty of Peace and under the terms of the agreement which has been worked between the two Governments, the American national who owns property in Italy is being dealt with in a manner which is fully satisfactory to his Government and to him.

Second. The American national who holds a claim against Italian property in this country is being given a better opportunity than he would otherwise have of obtaining satisfaction of that claim upon his proving in the usual manner in the courts that his claim is a meritorious one; and

Third. The American national who has a special claim against Italy arising out of the war is being assured that there will be money available for the payment of that claim and that it can be handled in an expeditious manner without any reference to the foreign government.

I should like to point out one basic reason why I think it is essential that the House pass this resolution now. When the United States delegation went to the Paris Peace Conference, they had two basic policies with respect to the question of reparations against Italy. The first was that the reparations should not be onerous or burdensome—that Italy could not possibly meet such claims. In other words, it was the intention of this Government that Italy, rather than remaining a country which could not possibly continue on a self-sufficient basis, should be restored to an economic vitality which would assure not only a democratic government in Italy, not only the absence of the need of aid from the United States, but also an Italy which would be able to contribute in a positive manner to world peace.

The second basic policy of this Government was that the reparation formula should not be one which would require this Government to give aid to Italy in order that it could pay off its reparation claims to other countries.

In the very beginning our negotiators had to face the following facts: Twenty-two billion dollars worth of reparation claims were filed against Italy by other governments. Clearly and obviously such a huge amount could not under any circumstances be paid out by Italy. By continuous argument and by constantly pressing forward in the most convincing manner possible the arguments against such a large reparations claim being approved by the conference, this Government was able, as the conference was drawing to a close, to reduce that $22,000,000,000 worth of claims to $760,000,000 worth. However, this, too, was considered an unreasonable amount to charge against Italy. It was clear that if this amount was approved by the Paris peace negotiators, Italy would have no possibility of establishing a satisfactory economic and political future for itself. Our negotiators therefore made it very clear to the other governments that we

were not going to ask for any reparations against Italy. When we were accused of the intention of using Italian assets in the United States as a means of satisfying in a concealed way our reparation claims against Italy, we pressed forward with all vigor by stating our clear-cut intention of returning by far the greater portion of these assets. We made it very clear that while we were knocking down the reparation claims of other countries and while we were holding forth our position of not seeking reparations against Italy, we did not intend in any way or under any guise to use Italian assets in this country to meet our own claims. By making these arguments we were able, therefore, to reduce the amount of reparation claims against Italy as it now stands in the treaty of peace, to $360,000,000. We started with $22,000,000,000 and we have succeeded in ending up with $360,000,000; but we did this only by assuring the other governments that we were not going to obtain reparations from Italy and that we would return the greater part of the Italian assets in this country to Italy.

Were this House now to take a policy different from that which proved so successful to the Paris Peace Conference negotiators, the consequences will be disastrous. I believe it would be a grave mistake for us to jeopardize this settlement by acting inconsistently with the strongly and publicly stated policies of our Government.

Further than that our failure to pass this legislation will have a lamentable psychological and political effect on the Italian people. It is vital that Italy remain on the right side of the iron curtain.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I am confining myself largely to the question of the ships involved. A letter from the Under Secretary refers to two categories. There are really, as I see it, three categories of ships. The first relates to eight ships which have been seized by this country and which we undertook to return to the Government of Italy. Second, 5 ships which have been purchased by this Government from Brazil and Venezuela and which we undertook to return to Italy; and, third, 18 vessels seized prior to December 7, 1941, subsequently requisitioned by the United States for use in the war effort and thereafter lost.

What we are doing in the second category, as I have it, is this; we are taking five ships that were taken by Brazil and Venezuela which were of Italian registry. We bought those five ships from Brazil and Venezuela. We paid cash for them. We now propose to give those same five ships back to Italy.

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. Will the gentleman tell us what we paid for those ships?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am not sure that I have the entire amount here that we paid for them.

The valuation of the 18 ships in the third category is also, I am sorry to say, not available; but the official cost of building a Liberty ship was about $1,728,000. We undertook to replace the Italian ships which have been lost with Liberty ships at a million and three-quarters.

But I want to speak in particular about those five ships we bought from Brazil and Venezuela. We bought those ships. We gave Brazil and Venezuela cash. Now we plan to give the ships back to Italy; and I think the House should know that Brazil and Venezuela have also given the cash back to Italy. So the Italian Government will be in receipt of both the ships and the cash, and the American Government will be in receipt of nothing whatsoever. That seems to me to be somewhat too generous to Italy in view of the fact that while we are returning the larger part of Italian assets in the United States to Italy we are not clearly protecting our American citizens from any claims which they may have to the Italian assets because while we are reserving $5,000,000 to take care of American citizens there is no evidence before us as to how much the claims of American citizens will be or whether that will be adequate.

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. As I understand, the plan is to give the Italian Government Liberty ships now controlled by the Maritime Commission.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. That is my understanding.

Mr. BONNER. Can the gentleman show us under what authority this can be done? Under what system or arrangement can we take ships from the Maritime Commission and give them to the Italian Government when we already have legislation authorizing the Maritime Commission to sell these ships?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. You cannot do it unless this joint resolution is adopted.

Mr. BONNER. Does it amend the Ships Sales Act as passed by this House?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. It has the effect of that. It amends the Trading with the Enemy Act of 1917. It does not precisely state that it amends the Ships Sales Act, but that certainly would be the effect of it, in my opinion. The concern I have is whether or not we are being too anxious to take care of the Italian Government before we take care of the claims of American citizens of Italian or other origin who have claims.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, according to the testimony given before the Deficiency Committee just a few days ago by the Maritime Commission, we were told they will have approximately 7,200 ships to be disposed of, some of which are Liberty ships and LST's. They also indicated it is going to cost more money to take care of the repairs, reconditioning, guarding, and so forth of these ships than we will get for them through ultimate sale. I have the information, questioning the officials of the Maritime Commission, that an LST boat cost more than a Liberty ship. I was told that a Liberty ship cost approximately $1,500,000 and that the junk value would be approximately $75,000, that an LST cost originally $1,700,000 and the junk value, they estimate, may be $75,000, perhaps less.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee where they get the information that the junk value of these Liberty ships is $10,000, what condition these ships are in, and so forth?

Of course, the price depends upon the condition of the ship.

Mr. HINSHAW. The information obtained by the committee is from a letter written by the Under Secretary of State, Robert H. Lovett, dated July 19, 1947, in which he says:

> With respect to the Liberty ships the official figures which have been released concerning the estimated cost of building a Liberty ship are: Estimated prewar cost, $1,278,000; estimated wartime cost, $1,728,590.

Mr. STEFAN. There is not very much difference between the original cost figures I gave and the figures the gentleman gives me. The testimony in our committee, however, does not jibe with the figures and information we are now getting.

Mr. HINSHAW. I will quote that if the gentleman will give me the opportunity:

> We are also advised that the scrap value of Liberty ships is as low as $10,000 each, while the maximum scrap of any Liberty ship does not exceed $50,000.

That is where the information of the committee came from.

Mr. STEFAN. There is apparent difference of information between the Department of State and the Maritime Commission. The departments should get together on facts so Congress can get some reliable information.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not know that.

Mr. STEFAN. Now, I want to ask another question. A young man who told me that he is an American citizen claims he has a large claim which may be affected by this bill. He mentioned a large amount and stated he would be very happy to take one or two of those Liberty ships for this claim. Can the gentleman give me some explanation of that? I do not know the details, but I want to help American citizens. I have no sympathy for our former enemies. The death of our soldiers in Italy is too fresh in my mind. I cannot forget that Italy fought against us. So I want to know now, before this bill is passed, whether or not American citizens are being protected.

Mr. HINSHAW. American citizens certainly are being protected. They have the right, which they always had, to file their claims against the Italian Government and they are protected pursuant to a memorandum of agreement.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman believe that this particular American citizen will be protected under this bill?

Mr. HINSHAW. I do.

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

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. With reference to whether or not the American citizen is protected, I want to read a paragraph from a letter that the Department of Justice wrote me July 23. It says:

Information concerning the identity of the persons believed to have been the former owners of the larger items of Italian property now held by the Office of Alien Property has already been sent you. It is estimated by the Office of Alien Property that approximately 45 percent of the property which will be returnable if Senate Joint Resolution 138 is adopted was formerly owned by corporations and approximately 55 percent by individuals and partnerships.

Also I quote the pertinent part of a State Department letter, written July 24:

There is no information on file in the Department of State * * * of an American national having claims against Italy arising out of personal injury * * * or maltreatment while prisoners of war in cases of members of our armed forces.

Mr. STEFAN. All I want to know is whether or not American citizens are protected. Does the gentleman believe they are?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No claims, says the State Department, have been filed by any American citizens. They have no record of any whatsoever.

Mr. STEFAN. This legislation is being rushed through too quickly. More accurate information should be given to the Congress before this is enacted into law.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard.

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

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. Further, in relation to the question of the protection of American citizens, this letter is from the Department of State, dated July 24. It says:

At the present time there is no information on file in the Department of State or to its knowledge in any Government agency of an American national having claims against Italy arising out of personal injury in the case of civilians or maltreatment while prisoners of war in cases of members of our armed forces.

In answer to a question along this line which I asked one of the witnesses from the State Department he said that he knew of no instances where American citizens have filed claims. He further said that no information has been given out by the State Department to the effect that if American citizens filed claims there would be a way by which they could recover.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to take the time of the House on a question such as we have here, but I took an oath of office to support the Constitution of the United States, and when I came here to Congress I made up my mind that I was going to try to do the best I knew how to try to operate the Government for the benefit of the American people.

We were dragged into a war that we did not want to get into. We have been in two of them in the last 20 years, and we never should have been in either one of them. But, now, since we have gotten into this last one, we have gotten to the point, as I see it, where we think we should be the guardian angels of every nation in the world, and I do not believe that we ever intended to be that and I do not believe that we can ever be that. We have got a great job to look after our own country. Some people think that after you get into a war and you win the war that you have got to do everything that we are trying to do with the money of the people of America, who are keeping their noses down to the grindstone at almost every turn, to help out with solving the problems of all the world. I do not think that that is our business and I, for one, am not going to assume that responsibility. I think if our State Department can help these countries in certain ways, that we ought to try to do it—work with them—be good friends. But, when it comes to a time that we are going to drag America down, and all the American institutions with it, then I want to tell you that it is time to get up here and fight, and that is just what I am trying to do today. I am fighting to save America from going into bankruptcy.

We got these vessels from Italy. We brought them over here or used them over there. Venezuela and Brazil took the ships belonging to Italy that were in their harbors. After we got started in the war, Uncle Sam, the great benefactor, went down to Venezuela and Brazil and bought the ships and paid cash for them. Then we brought them up here. Now we are giving them back to Italy. We are giving back to Italy all the vessels we took from her, and we paid Venezuela and Brazil for those ships. Venezuela and Brazil gave the money that they got for the ships back to Italy. Now we are offering to pay Italy again for all the ships we sunk during the war, either in cash or by giving them ships of our own to make up the difference. If you do that, if your constituents want you to do that, all right, but wait until you get back home and you will find out whether some of them will not do a lot of kicking about what you are doing down here. If they kick to me that they want me to do that, they will have to send somebody else down here, because I am going to protect the American people, who do not want this thing of trying to destroy the American way of life, the American freedom we have enjoyed, and the American standard of living. It is about time we wake up, or else we will not have anything to wake up to. The first thing you know you will give everything you have away, and you will have nothing to think about but what the radicals of this country will do to you after you tear down the good, sound-thinking American people of this country.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman should know that what is actually involved here is property that belongs to Italian nationals which was taken over by the Alien Property Custodian and which we are now returning to them. This is the result of a side agreement entered into between Secretary Byrnes and the representatives of the Italian Government at the time they were negotiating the treaty between Italy and the United States and our Allies. Italy received such an unjust treaty that the least we can do now is to keep our word, our commitment that was made in the name of the people of the United States, and return to the Italians their own property.

Mr. RICH. Yes, we might have to agree to the commitments that are already made, but we have to get some men that are for America, we have to have some men pretty soon that will give consideration to the welfare of the United States. We have had too many people in official position in the last four or five years who want to hand everything over to some other country. We still have a lot of them. The quicker we get rid of them the better, and get some men in there that will look after the interest and the welfare of America before it is too late.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The gentleman from New York made the statement that Italy is the victim of an unjust treaty. I should like to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask the gentleman from New York who is responsible for that unjust treaty with Italy.

Mr. RICH. Why does not the gentleman ask him? I will give him time.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. While I ordinarily go along 100 percent with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, yet I think he will wish to correct his remarks when he undertakes to say that this country was dragged into this war.

Mr. RICH. We were dragged into it, when we had Pearl Harbor and they went over there and tried to destroy it. We got started in it there. But we had a President of the United States that said, "I promise you mothers again and again and again, I will keep you out of war." That same President did everything under the sun to get us into that war, and he did that before we had Pearl Harbor, too. The gentleman knows it.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I may know that, which I deny, but——

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean to say that was not the case?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I absolutely do.

Mr. RICH. Then I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. It is my understanding in this proposed bill you are going to give the Italian Government 20 ships from the laid-up fleet after we provided in the ship sale bill to sell these ships to

American owners and foreign owners. We had a binding understanding that only that price would be taken for the ships and we assured American operators that no other ships would go on the seas in international trade other than at the price written in the ship sale bill. So if this passes we are breaking faith with these American operators who have come in and bought the ships as well as with the foreign operators because this is competition that they are not expecting. It is unfair competition besides so far as the ships sale bill is concerned which is the law of the land.

Mr. RICH. Then, if we enact this legislation, we are breaking faith with some of our American people. So that we find out we are getting so mixed up as time goes on that you get in a whirl and you do not know where you are going and you do not know what commitments have been made.

My time has expired and that is too bad, because we probably could discuss this for hours and I think it ought to be discussed for hours.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to answer the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] who wants to know from me who is responsible for the unjust treaty that the Italian people received. I answer him very simply—the Big Four will have to share that responsibility. But that is neither here nor there. Italy is going through a terrible period of economic hardship. What we are doing here is not giving Italy any of our money at all. We are simply returning to the Italian nationals property that was taken over by the Enemy Alien Property Custodian. We are also giving Italy a few ships, replacing those ships which we took from Italy which have been destroyed or are now obsolete. We are replacing them with our Liberty ships. This bill carries out a commitment that Secretary Byrnes made to the representatives of the Italian Government at the time the treaty with Italy was being negotiated.

We are being asked here today to keep our word with the people of Italy, a word that was given by our then Secretary of State to Italy when he was dealing with the representatives of the Italian Government. The least we can do is to keep this promise to Italy after having broken so many that had been made to her.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I trust that this afternoon the Members of this House will vote to suspend the rules and pass the pending resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to provide for returns of Italian property in the United States. Adoption of this resolution before the close of this session is urged by the Department of State in the interest of strengthening our foreign policy. It merely carries out the commitments made in our behalf by Secretary of State Byrnes. Simple justice requires its immediate passage. As stated in the following telegram addressed to me by Luigi Antonini, president of the Italian-American Labor Council, which I shall read, "It will have a tremendous helpful effect on the cause of democracy in Italy." The Senate has already recognized this and favorably considered Senate Joint Resolution 138. It merely authorizes the transfer or return to Italy by the United States of certain ships which have been in lay-up for a considerable time, and provides means for the return to the Italian Government and its nationals of those Italian properties now held by the Office of Alien Property. This legislation will strengthen the Italian economy and aid not only our national interest but the interest of world peace. It implements American foreign policy. I am sure that this vitally important resolution will receive your sympathetic consideration. I respectfully urge its immediate adoption.

The telegram I referred to reads as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 24, 1947.*

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House Office Building:

The Italian-American Labor Council urges you to use your influence and your vote in favor of the bill already approved by the Senate and defined as the "draft joint resolution to provide for return of Italian property in the United States and for other purposes." Our organization is confident that the above bill will be passed by the House of Representatives before its adjournment as it will have a tremendous helpful effect on the cause of democracy in Italy.

LUIGI ANTONINI, *President.*

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple question: Are we going to live up to the commitment that we made in the treaty of peace with Italy? Are we going to stick to our word? It is true that we have bought these ships from Brazil and that they were seized from the Italian nationals—that is true. But I say to you gentlemen that when General Marshall, the Secretary of State, comes and says, "This is needed in order that peace and quiet may be restored on the face of the earth," I am going to stand by him, and I feel that every Member of the House, regardless of what my friend from Pennsylvania may say, agrees with me absolutely on that question.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I think this is good legislation and hope it will be enacted.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in 3 minutes it will be difficult to emphasize, to the extent it should be, the importance of this legislation. I shall try, however, to do so by emphasizing, first, the thought which was just expressed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], and the same thought which was likewise expressed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

This whole question resolves itself into whether or not we are willing upon our part, as a nation, to make good the promises that were made by our American representatives in negotiating the Italian peace treaty. I think everyone is aware of the difficult situation that confronts our representatives in bringing that treaty to a conclusion. We were faced with situations that required them, as evidence of good faith upon our part, to promise to do the things that are provided for in this bill.

I am not going to peer into every nook and corner to see whether this or that or the other should have been done. I have confidence in the patriotism and Americanism of those who represented us in those crucial days. I believe they did everything humanly possible to bring into being a treaty that would be fair to all concerned. As far as I am concerned, I am going to vote for the passage of this bill, and, thereby uphold their hands and make good the promises they made in the name of our country.

I get tired of hearing individuals rise on this floor and remind Members that they have taken an oath of office. We are all aware of it. I am certain each of us is just as sincerely trying to carry out his and her oath and their obligation to our country as some of those who so frequently impress upon the House that they are trying to do so and leaving an inference that those who vote differently are not doing so. I am also of the opinion that if some of those who have criticized this bill as lacking in due regard for the rights of our nationals had spent as much time in studying it as they have in talking about it, I am certain they would have come to a different conclusion than they have with respect to it.

Do not think for a moment that our nationals have been overlooked. This bill takes care of our nationals. A sufficient amount of Italian property is retained or subject to lien to adequately protect and satisfy all possible claims.

In the second place most of these ships are no good to us nor of any use to us other than as scrap. Go down to the James River, go up to the Hudson, go to the other places where these ships have been pulled up and taken out of service, and you will see what I am saying is absolutely the truth. It is not taking money out of the pockets of our nationals. It is not taking money out of the pockets of Uncle Sam. But it is fulfilling an obligation that our American representatives made when the Italian treaty was negotiated. The promises our representatives made at that time helped greatly in achieving a treaty that gave some measure of help and security to the Italian Government in stabilizing its economic structure.

Senator VANDENBERG made a statement to the Senate when this bill was under consideration in that body. He explained the difficulties under which he and his colleagues labored in an effort to effect a peace treaty. It was absolutely necessary that a treaty be concluded at that time. It was a crucial situation they faced. The promise, which this bill embodies, undoubtedly was a determining factor in fixing the terms of peace set forth in the treaty. When Senator VANDENBERG had finished his statement, the Senate immediately passed the bill unanimously. I hope the House will do likewise.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, is it possible to gain 1 minute by unanimous consent to read a part of the regulations?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain such a request. Under the rules, 20 minutes is allowed on each side.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the pending resolution a draft memorandum of understanding between Italy and the United States is in process of preparation for signature. Appended to that draft is annex I from which I quote as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF ITALY REGARDING ITALIAN ASSETS IN THE UNITED STATES AND CERTAIN CLAIMS OF UNITED STATES NATIONALS

ANNEX I

The United States intends to effect returns, pursuant to article I, paragraph 1 (a) of this memorandum of understanding, by appropriate legislation permitting returns of vested property to Italy and subjects or citizens of Italy and corporations or associations organized under the laws of Italy upon the terms and conditions generally applicable to return of such property to others eligible for return pursuant to section 32 of the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended.

It is understood that while the United States will seek to eliminate Italian nationality as a disqualification from eligibility for return pursuant to section 32 (a) of the Trading with the Enemy Act.

(a) The United States does not intend to assume any obligation to make returns to any of the following:

(1) the Italian Fascist Party, any organization closely affiliated therewith (other than the Italian Government) or any person who was a member of such party or organization at any time after September 8, 1943; or

(2) Any person, firm or organization convicted of violation of any of the statutes set forth in section 34 (a) of the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended; or

(3) Any person, firm or organization convicted of war crimes or having collaborated with any enemy country after September 8, 1943; or

(4) Any person, firm or organization indicted or officially charged with war crimes or with having collaborated with an enemy country after September 8, 1943, until such person, firm or organization has been officially acquitted or cleared of such indictment or charge; or

(5) A corporation or association organized under the laws of any country other than Italy or Trieste; or

(6) Any individual who was at any time after December 7, 1941, a citizen or subject of a nation other than Italy with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war; or

(7) Any individual voluntarily resident at any time since December 7, 1941, within the territory of any nation other than Italy with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war;

(b) Ultimate disposition of property falling under the terms of section (a), paragraphs (1)-(7) above is reserved for future decision by the Government of the United States, after consultation between the governments of Italy and the United States;

(c) The United States does not intend to make returns in any case in which it deems that return would be contrary to its interests in respect of national security or antitrust or fiscal policy; and

(d) The United States does not intend to assume any obligation to make returns of any property which was used pursuant to an arrangement to cloak or to conceal any property or interest within the United States of any person ineligible to receive a return under section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading with the Enemy Act.

It is further understood that in the case of any literary, artistic or industrial property to be returned, the property shall remain subject to all licenses and agreements for licenses which were granted or entered into by the United States with respect to it and which were in effect immediately prior to return; and any rights of the United States to revoke any such license or agreement for licenses shall not be included within the return.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call special attention to paragraph (a) (1) above and to the fact that on September 8, 1943, the Fascist Party of Italy was disbanded by decree. Hence there is little meaning to that language.

I believe it to be the intention of our committee, of which I have the honor of being the ranking majority member, that neither Nazis nor Fascists should obtain return of any of their property that had been vested in the United States by any agency of our Government. We are perfectly willing to have the vested property of non-Fascists returned to them, pursuant to this resolution.

It is therefore urged that this language I have referred to in annex I (a) (1) be revised to eliminate all possibility of return of vested assets to any Italian who participated in the affairs of the Fascist Party prior to September 8, 1943, as well as subsequently. It was the Fascist Party in control of the Italian Government that with the Nazis engulfed the world, including ourselves, in war and destruction. We are no more concerned with ex-Fascists of Italy than with the happily departed Duce himself.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this legislation to implement the agreement of our Secretary of State with Italy. The treaty of peace with Italy was a hard treaty. This will soften the burden and help the Italian people who were our cobelligerents in the past war to get back on their feet. We are doing this by recognizing the rights we accorded them when we accepted the Italians as cobelligerents in the war against the Nazis.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this resolution when it comes to a vote. I believe it falls within our foreign policy to aid in the reconstruction of postwar nonmonarchist Italy. It is in line with our insistence that those we help shall do all that is possible to help themselves. We will be furnishing the Italian people with precious means for self-help if we pass this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey to suspend the rules and pass the resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 138.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENT CONTROL ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1590) to amend the District of Columbia rent-control law so as to provide that schools and universities may recover possession of housing accommodations in certain cases.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1941, as amended, is amended by (1) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or," and (2) adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(6) The landlord, being a recognized school or an accredited nonprofit university, has a bona fide need for the premises for educational, research, administrative, or dormitory use."

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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks with respect to agricultural research in Alaska.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER CONFERENCE REPORTS WITHOUT PRINTING IN RECORD

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the balance of the week to consider conference reports as they are submitted, notwithstanding the fact that they have not been printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the persistently gloomy world picture has so engrossed itself upon the American people

and the Congress that we sometimes overlook important steps of progress on the road to peace. Yet we are told that every cloud must have its silver lining, and recently I have observed two events which have given me great encouragement. One of these events received considerable publicity but the the other, of equal importance in my opinion, has received little or no attention in the press.

The first item was the phenomenal reception to the first public offering of the securities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development last week. The World Bank is designed as a long-term lending agency for rebuilding factories, harbors, railroads, and the like destroyed during the war. On the basis of resources and guaranties of all member countries, its founders hoped from the beginning to tap various sources of investment and to give reconstruction and development credits to governments and government-sponsored borrowers. But not until last week was it known how great or how small might be the confidence of private investors in this new adjunct of the United Nations. According to the New York Times of July 17, 1947, the bank recently announced that it was preparing two issues of its securities aggregating $250,000,000. These issues were cleared by the Security and Exchange Commission at 3:30 Monday afternoon, July 14. Subscription books were opened at the beginning of business on Tuesday, July 15, and by noon officials of the bank announced that the offering had been heavily oversubscribed. This display of confidence in the world bank must have been gratifying to former Assistant Secretary of War, John J. McCloy, now president of the bank, and to his staff. I am sure that all Americans who are interested in the maintenance of a sound and healthy economy of private capitalism view with satisfaction the coordination of effort in financing the capital needs of devastated sections of the world. As the New York Times editorial observed:

> No such emphatic demonstration as this could have taken place in the absence of public confidence in the bank and what it essentially symbolizes—the determination and ability of the world ultimately to work its way back to vigorous economic and political health.

Of perhaps equal importance, Mr. Speaker, was the decision last week of the Republican membership of the Committee on Ways and Means not to issue a contemplated critical report of the reciprocal trade program of the United States, and the efforts of the United States and 17 other countries at Geneva to lay the foundation for an International Trade Organization. The reciprocal trade policies, formulated by the Congress under the sound guidance of that eminent statesman, Hon. Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, is the best antidote to the poisonous economic warfare that already looms on the continent of Europe. The International Trade Organization is an effort on a broad scale to deal with the problem of reducing public and private barriers to trade and of eliminating trade discriminations.

Some questions have been raised about the relationship, if any, between the ITO and the Marshall plan for economic rehabilitation of Europe. In a press conference on July 2, 1947, Under Secretary of State, William L. Clayton, made a very simple explanation of the interdependence of these two proposals. Mr. Clayton said:

> The object of General Marshall's suggestions is the prompt rehabilitation of the European economy, through Europe's joint efforts, assisted by the United States.
>
> The object of ITO is to bring about agreement among nations covering their international economic relationships, in order to assist them to maintain a stable economy once it has been rehabilitated.
>
> The Marshall plan makes the ITO negotiations more important than ever because without a sound permanent program of reciprocal multilateral trade, no temporary emergency program could possibly have any permanent worth-while result.

As I view the problem, the Marshall plan involves the cooperation of the United States with the 16 countries now meeting at Paris in determining the capital needs for the reconstruction of the European economy and the available resources for such capital. These capital requirements may be provided jointly by the World Bank, appropriations by the United States Congress, and sources within the stricken countries. The Marshall plan will provide the machinery and the engines to get the factories, mines, and railroads of industrial Europe humming once again. But to revive the productive capacity of these European nations will be of little avail if, in self-defense, each nation feels compelled to maintain quotas and exchange restrictions which preclude the flow of world commerce.

In many respects our planning for the long-range development of world trade and the abolition of artificial barriers to commerce has received greater immediate attention than the pressing problem of starting the wheels of industry.

In his Harvard speech, Secretary Marshall emphasized how grave is the danger of a complete break-down in the modern system of the division of labor upon which the exchange of products is based. He pointed out that in vast areas in Europe town and city industries are not producing adequate goods to exchange with the food-producing farmer. Since the farmer cannot find the goods for sale which he desires to purchase, he feeds more grain to stock and provides his family with a more ample supply of food, although he may have insufficient clothing and other necessities of civilization.

The Paris Conference is the answer to General Marshall's suggestion that the European countries draft a program designed to place Europe on its feet economically. There has been some suggestion that the venture is too costly for the United States to undertake. It has been said that our resources are inadequate for the task, but just as we could neither avert nor win World War II by thinking about its cost, neither can we avoid the responsibility nor the adverse efforts to our own country and our own way of living by placing a dollar and cents limitation upon the economic recovery of western European civilization.

So the Marshall plan and the ITO are integral parts of the over-all plan for the restoration of world economic stability. The capital advanced by the United States or by the World Bank cannot be repaid unless an agency like the ITO establishes rules for international trade. We sometimes lose sight of the importance to freedom of enterprise in this country in having a pattern of international trade in which the major decisions are reached by private buyers and sellers in active competition, rather than by governments. Those who fear the power which may be vested in the proposed International Trade Organization should not fail to consider the alternative of quotas, exchange restrictions, and domination of trade through international monopolies and cartels.

One of the outstanding achievements of the current session of the Congress has been the bipartisan support of our foreign economic policy, as well as of our foreign policy in general.

Prior to the departure of Under Secretary of State Clayton for Geneva for the reciprocal trade and ITO negotiations, the President issued an Executive order establishing certain definite trade-agreements procedures. One of these provisions requires the inclusion of an escape clause in all trade agreements hereafter negotiated. The President's order was the result of conversations between Under Secretaries of State Acheson and Clayton and Members of another body. In his statement announcing the issuance of his Executive order, the President said that these Members agreed that we should go forward with the Geneva negotiations. Nevertheless, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means called extensive hearings to investigate the operation of the reciprocal trade program, including the proposed International Trade Organization. When the hearings ended after several weeks it was considered not unlikely that the majority would prepare a public report which might prove embarrassing to the leadership of the United States at Geneva. The decision of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means not to issue such a report, as I said at the beginning, has received little consideration by the press. I have taken this opportunity, therefore, to express my congratulations for this demonstration on the part of the House of the same fine bipartisan support of our foreign economic policy that had already been demonstrated on the part of the leadership of the Senate.

The reciprocal trade program has the overwhelming support of the American people. Public-opinion polls show that from 75 to 80 percent of the public favor the extension of this important pillar of our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks at this point an article from Modern Industry of April 15, 1947, and another item from Modern Industry of June 15, 1947, which magazine conducted the most recent public poll on this question.

[From Modern Industry of April 15, 1947]

SHOULD THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM BE CONTINUED?

"YES," SAYS C. A. RICHARDS, DIRECTOR, EXPORT DIVISION, INTERCHEMICAL CORP., NEW YORK

(In the export business for over 50 years, Richards is president of the Philippine-American Chamber of Commerce, and served as

consultant to United States Government during the war.)

Because—

1. Our exports to countries with whom we have reciprocal agreements rose 63 percent as against 32 percent to others. Imports from countries with agreements rose 22 percent, compared with 12½ percent from others.

2. So far no American industry has suffered under the agreements—escape clauses are rarely invoked.

3. We can compete successfully with foreign products, despite our higher labor costs, because of our greater manufacturing know-how.

4. The real deterrent to foreign trade is quota systems, not tariffs.

I am not a free trader, but am for freedom of trade. I believe that the reciprocal trade program should be continued because of what it has already done to help our export trade, which is my first interest.

The necessity for the program initiated by Secretary of State Hull in 1933 was largely caused by the passage in 1930 of the Hawley-Smoot tariff. It raised many rates of duty to a point where our importation of certain commodities became very difficult, if not impossible.

In retaliation, many countries immediately raised tariff, exchange, and other barriers against imports from this country.

The first reciprocal trade agreement law empowered the President to reduce these 1930 tariff rates by a maximum of 50 percent. The Doughton bill, passed in 1945, gave the President the power to reduce the rates in effect on January 1, 1945, by 50 percent. Since passage of the Doughton bill, no tariffs have been reduced, although there are some reductions contemplated at the meetings of the 18 nations to be held in Geneva this month.

No United States industry of any size has been seriously interfered with by reductions made in the 1930 rates to date. We should view this whole program, not from the viewpoint of what harm it could do, but what harm it has done and what benefits have accrued from it. I have asked men in a position to know, who have been opposed to its continuance, what important industries have been harmed, and have been unable to find any.

Furthermore, since the first agreement was made there have been some complaints made to the Government regarding concessions, and these have been divided into two groups: one, unimportant complaints frequently arising from misunderstandings of the agreements; and the second, those that might be termed formal complaints.

As a result, supplementary agreements have been concluded with Canada and Switzerland. The concession granted on handkerchiefs in the trade agreement with Switzerland was ended, and an informal agreement was reached to restrict the importation of watches and parts. In January of this year the State Department announced a proposed termination of the concession on linen fire hose, granted in the trade agreement with Canada.

Program is flexible

These facts have been provided by the Committee for Reciprocity Information. They fairly conclusively show that, to date, operation of the reciprocal trade program has proved that, where necessary to the protection of our own industry, conditions can be altered.

Furthermore, in the trade agreement signed with Mexico on December 23, 1942, there is an escape clause. In the recent Executive order of the President, it is officially stated that a clause to the same effect will be incorporated in all future trade agreements. Since the signing of the agreement with Mexico over 4 years ago, no complaints have been filed with the committee under this clause.

Few changes to date

Space is lacking to recite the many changes which the Government might have made in our tariff structure but did not. Yet one or two might be cited to emphasize the care with which the program has been handled to date:

Take the case of yarn spun of rayon. In the Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph 1303, this duty is stipulated at 12½ cents a pound, plus an ad valorem duty of 45 percent and 50 percent, depending on whether singles or plied. Despite the power given the President over all these years, this rate has not been changed. If the Doughton bill's provisions are used, the most it can be reduced is to 6¼ cents a pound, plus 22½ percent and 25 percent, respectively.

Don't overlook the fact that the power, under the Doughton bill, to reduce tariffs by 50 percent is not from the original 1930 rate, but from the January 1, 1945, rate.

Therefore, if the tariff has not been reduced on any article, the most the President can do is to reduce it 50 percent from the 1930 rate. If it has already been reduced the full 50 percent permitted by the original bill, that rate may be reduced another 50 percent, which will make the total reduction 75 percent.

Another instance: Paragraph 1108 in the 1930 tariff covers woven woolens weighing not more than 4 ounces a square yard. Under the 1930 tariff the rate was 50 cents a pound, plus 50 percent ad valorem, 55 percent ad valorem, and 60 percent ad valorem, depending upon the value of the fabric. The President has not changed the specific duty, but he has reduced the ad valorem to a flat 37½ percent.

Nub—it fosters trade

On the other hand, the fact should be emphasized, as was set forth in Mr. Clayton's letter of January 16 to Senator HUGH BUTLER, that between 1934–35 and 1938–39 our exports to countries with which we had trade agreements increased 63 percent, as against 32 percent with countries with whom we did not have trade agreements. In the same period our imports from those with whom we had trade agreements increased 22 percent, against 12½ percent from the others.

No fact brings out more emphatically the advantages which have accrued to us from this reciprocal trade program.

Another often-quoted argument against the program is the contention that if we lower tariffs, we necessarily must lower our own standards of living. I cannot find any proof of this alleged effect. Standards of living in this country are the highest in the world. And yet, for over 50 years I have been in the export business and seen exports grow. Why?

Because we lead the world in producing certain articles better and cheaper than they could be produced by the countries from which we import them.

United States is more efficient

For example, the production per man of coal in England is less than 2 tons a day. In this country it is about 50 tons a day. Surely, with this increased production we can afford to pay our miners higher wages than the miners in England receive.

In 1938, the last prewar year, we imported about $28,000,000 worth of cotton manufactures and semimanufactures, on which a duty averaging 44.9 percent, equivalent to $12,586,000, was imposed.

In 1944 the British Government sent a mission here headed by Sir Frank Platt, British cotton controller. This mission investigated our entire textile industry. On its return a report was made from which I should like to quote one sentence:

"British P. M. H. [production per man per hour] (calculated on the basis of total output and total labor force) is less than the American by about 18 to 49 percent in spinning, by 80 to 85 percent in winding, by 70 to 89 percent in beaming, and by 56 to 67 percent in weaving."

Revise, but keep the law

It is my hope that when the program comes up again in 1948 that the Congress will extend the existing law, making any administrative changes which may seem desirable beyond those covered by the President's recent Executive order, so long as they do not make the program unworkable.

I have never found any opponent who had facts to justify opposition to the continuance of the program. But they had fear—fear that the power given the executive branch of the Government might harm some United States industry. This fear has no justification based on the facts known to date.

Tariff isn't the only bar

One other very important point is too frequently overlooked in considering this program: That a serious deterrent to international trade today lies, not only in the amount of the tariff collected by any country, including ourselves, on the importation of the product, but in some of the semivisible handicaps to freedom of international trade which have been cropping up during the war and since VJ-day.

For example, there is the recent Argentine announcement of three exchange rates—which is in effect an increase in tariff on certain items of 13 percent and on other items of 32 percent. There is also the quota system used by some countries, which is far more injurious to international trade than the tariff. Quotas set the maximum of a commodity that may be imported from a country, whereas the commodity may be free or dutiable. Under a tariff, even though high, persons may import if they wish to pay the price. But under the quota system imports are definitely limited.

The quota system is not new but it is growing; and it is one of the evils which our representatives at Geneva intend to bring into the open and endeavor to eliminate to the maximum extent.

Repeatedly it has been said that even in this country our tariff is not as big a deterrent to imports as the Treasury Department decisions, made under the tariff. Active steps are now being taken to put our own house in order.

NO, SAYS HAROLD J. WALTER, PRESIDENT, UXBRIDGE WORSTED CO., INC., UXBRIDGE, MASS.

Because—

1. Lower tariffs would harm many United States industries and kill, among others, the textile industry which can't compete against foreign labor.

2. Our national defense would be jeopardized if we face another crisis with a weakened textile industry to supply our armed forces.

3. Mass unemployment here would wreak havoc on the world economy, whereas several million unemployed in such low-pay countries as France, England, Germany, India, China, etc., would have little effect on the world.

4. America can help the world only if her industries remain prosperous.

Lowering tariffs, we are told, promises a panacea for all of the world's ills; for bringing prosperity to impoverished countries, for creating good will and understanding between this country and others; for leading the way toward continuing world peace; for increasing the already astronomical United States income of $175,000,000,000 yearly.

Can tariff be all these things—do all these things? Are not several of these arguments irreconciliable?

Before a decision, we must decide first what a tariff is, not only by definition but also in terms of what it means to workers, to the manufacturer of textiles, the manufacturer of automobiles or typewriters or razor blades, to the politician, and to the Department of State.

A tariff is a tax placed on foreign goods at entry into this country. This tax is designed for two purposes: (1) To provide revenue for the Government; and (2) to protect American manufacturers from a flood of foreign goods which, cheaply produced in countries with lower living standards than ours, can undersell our products in domestic markets.

What does the average worker know about tariffs? Not much.

If he thinks at all about tariffs, he thinks of them in terms of his favorite radio commentator or the particular slant which his newspaper gives him. For the most part, however, the worker has little or no idea what a tariff is, what it is designed to do, or what the present arguments for further reductions under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act are about. He knows little or nothing of how tariffs affect his job, his industry.

Using the same definition, how does the American textile manufacturer feel about the tariff?

He feels that the tariff has been a bulwark against foreign rivals which could have in the past, and will in the future if further reductions are made, put him out of business.

His reasons are simple and easily understood:

Labor is the dominant cost factor in textile manufacturing. There are still few, if any, true mechanical operations or manpower short cuts. Expanding operations or larger volume does not decrease unit labor cost as in many industries.

Labor costs in textiles now rank with some of the highest. The figures show a rise of 112 percent in 6 years. Yet even before these advances, textile labor costs were several times greater in the United States than in England, many times greater than those in Japan. Now, the disparity is even wider.

The average rate for textile work in the United States is now $1.20 an hour. In England, it is 35 cents an hour. On the Continent and in India and Japan, it is considerably less than the English figure. Even allowing for the greater efficiencies of American labor and machinery, it is impossible to overcome this wide separation.

Leaders of the textile industry believe the present tariff must be maintained if there is to be a textile industry in the United States.

Do the manufacturers of automobiles, or typewriters, or razor blades see the same things when they look at the tariff? No.

These industries, and others, have become highly mechanical. Labor costs per unit have come down and down through the use of automatic machinery. They do not have to worry about cheap foreign labor because labor to them represents such a low cost on a unit basis.

In addition, United States technical advances have far outstripped those in most foreign countries. As a result, labor costs are about the same, despite the higher wages in this country, because more actual labor must be used abroad to produce the same article.

Whose ox is gored?

Tariffs are not needed to protect these industries. And since they have no fear that other countries will undersell them in the United States, they are in favor of reducing or removing tariffs on all goods, for instance, on textiles. A flood of textiles would build foreign exchange in this country for the purchase of machine goods. Textile production in England and France is rapidly recovering from the war and offers an immediate opportunity for exports.

Naturally United States machine industries oppose tariffs as hindrances to their expanding export business.

The politician, in far too many instances, views the tariff issue in terms of sectional advantage. Frequently it becomes a bargaining issue: "I'll vote for your tariff if you vote for my pork barrel."

The Department of State follows closely the line of the highly mechanized industries. Tariffs become barriers to expanding world trade. Reduction of tariffs, they say, enhances our position as the leading nation of the world.

Fact outweighs prejudice

Tariffs, the State Department and others would have us believe, only protect production inefficiencies. This is not a valid argument in the textile industry for a very simple reason, a reason which has been overlooked completely by proponents of tariff reduction because of ignorance, prejudice, or both.

Textiles, except where man-made fibers, such as rayon, nylon, are concerned, involve the processing of wool and cotton. No one has been able to raise sheep so that the hair on each is the same weight, length, and strength as that on the sheep next to it. Cotton, too, varies greatly from field to field, from season to season, and boll to boll.

Textiles deal with a product which is as variable as New England weather. It cannot be controlled as it is possible to manipulate the texture, hardness, or particular quality wanted in steel.

Textile plants are efficient

The charge of inefficiency cannot stand when knowledge is brought into the picture.

Here then, are the questions:

Is the textile manufacturer wrong to fight for his survival?

Is the automobile manufacturer right to fight to enlarge his industry, his export trade, at the expense of textiles?

Is the politician right in expressing himself in terms of prosperity for his own constituency, the rest of the country be damned?

Is the Department of State right in concerning itself with the unemployed of the world when the death of the textile and other industries is at stake with the consequent unemployment or displacement of millions of our own workers?

What are the answers?

Loss: $24,000,000,000

Ten million unemployed workers at $1.20 an hour in the United States means a reduction in the national income of $24,000,000,000. This does not take into consideration the additional losses because of decreased buying power, or lost taxes. These same 10,000,000 unemployed in England at 35 cents an hour reduce that country's income by only $7,000,000,000. In Japan, India, or China, the loss in income would be a mere two to three billion dollars or less.

Would it not mean more to the United States, and to the world, to keep those 10,000,000 people working right here than it would be to have 10,000,000 persons employed somewhere else in the world?

Two million unemployed in England, four million in France, Germany, and Poland, and four more million in India, China, and Japan, would have little effect on world economy.

But in the United States, 10,000,000 unemployed could spell depression and economic chaos in the world. Certainly these countries might have more foreign exchange to purchase goods here, but there is no assurance it would be all spent here; and even if it were, it would be but a drop in the bucket as compared to the $24,000,000,000 lost.

Would you care to decree the death of the seventh largest employer of labor in the United States, the textile industry, holding out only the wild-eyed promise that ultimately those thousands of persons now employed in that industry—who would be unemployed by its demise—would be absorbed into the remaining plants?

Would crush small towns

It is a great industry made up of small units. Many of these are responsible for the welfare of the villages in which they are situated. All together, they form a vital part of our national economy.

The textile industry depends on the tariff for its very life, and will continue to do so until technical advances reduce unit labor costs to compete with cheap foreign labor.

I use the textile industry as an example, because it is the one with which I am familiar. But many more industries ride in our boat. They need tariff protection, too.

Under present conditions, with tariffs at their present levels, England can ship cloth into our domestic markets and undersell American manufacturers. What good can accrue from a further lowering of the tariff?

Shield in time of war

Imagine the United States facing another crisis as it did in 1941 with a weak or negligible textile industry dependent on foreign sources for the uses of textiles in wartime.

The retention of strong armed forces is urged and draws little disagreement from informed sources. Yet many would nullify the effectiveness of those forces by weakening one of the principal sources of its supply.

America can help the world only if America can remain prosperous. Weakening certain industries to expand others is certainly not the way to keep America prosperous.

[From Modern Industry of July 15, 1947]

LANDSLIDE VOTE FOR RECIPROCAL TRADE

By a thumping majority of 81 to 19 percent, readers of Modern Industry from coast to coast voted "Yes" to the April 15 Debate in Print: Should the reciprocal trade-agreements program be continued?

C. A. Richards, director, export division, Interchemical Corp., New York, upheld the affirmative in that debate. He argued that no United States industry has suffered under the agreements; and that we can compete with foreign products, despite our higher labor costs, because of our greater manufacturing know-how.

Harold J. Walter, president, Uxbridge Worsted Co., Inc., Uxbridge, Mass., for the negative, maintained that lower tariffs would cripple many United States industries and kill the textile industry. We can help the world only if our industries remain sound.

Typical comments from voters agreeing with the "yes" side:

"By exporting, our manufacturers can maintain high production. But we cannot export unless we import in proportion." * * * "Extension of world trade is best assurance of peace."

"No" side: "Reciprocity in these agreements benefits other countries only." * * * "We have too high a standard of living to trade with other countries under a low tariff."

The area-by-area vote:

	"Yes" percent
New England	69.6
Mid-Atlantic	84.5
North Central	85.5
South	75.0
Midwest	75.4
Mountain and Pacific coast	78.8

	"No" percent
New England	30.4
Mid-Atlantic	15.5
North Central	14.5
South	25.0
Midwest	24.6
Mountain and Pacific coast	21.2

Congressmen and key Washington officials have already received these results.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the tremendous importance of the reciprocal trade

program to the establishment of an international trade organization and the ultimate success of the Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of Europe, not to mention the overwhelming support manifested by the American public, I trust that the Committee on Ways and Means will early in the next session report out a bill providing for the extension of the reciprocal trade authority of the President without restrictive amendments.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article written by Mr. Lyons in the Polish Review of July 10, 1947.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, insist on the amendment of the House and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VORYS, JUDD, FULTON, MANSFIELD, and ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question.

The SPEAKER. The time for the reservation of objections is past. The Chair had put the request, and it was agreed to.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question with reference to the bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may do so by unanimous consent.

Mr. RICH. Then I ask unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to go along in the regular way. I object to the consent request coming at this time.

STAMP COMMEMORATIVE OF THE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POULTRY INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 246, to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance, during 1948, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

Mr. SADLAK. As an outstanding branch of agriculture and figuring prominently in our everyday life the poultry industry proudly points to 100 years of service.

The oldest poultry show in the world got its start in Boston, Mass., and January 20 to 24, 1948, inclusive, is set aside for the Boston Poultry Show, marking a century of poultry progress. This exposition will cover every branch of the industry including breeding, processing, marketing of poultry, and great exhibits of live birds from every State in the Union. The entire Mechanics Building, covering a solid city block, has been engaged for the event. I understand that national organizations connected with the poultry industry have already scheduled their official annual meetings to coincide with this occasion.

And so we are approaching the centennial of the first organized effort in behalf of the poultry business which has developed to such a degree that it ranks second only, in money value, to the dairy industry.

A most interesting comment on this resolution appeared in the Baltimore Sun on Thursday morning, July 24, 1947, written by the Associated Press from Washington, as follows:

PROPOSED STAMP WOULD GIVE CHICKENS MUCH TO CACKLE ABOUT

WASHINGTON, JULY 23.—The 1,000,000,000 chickens in the country soon may have something they really can cackle and crow about.

For Representative SADLAK, Republican, of Connecticut, has just introduced into Congress a resolution calling for a special stamp in the chickens' honor.

SADLAK did this at the request of Paul Ives, editor of Cackle and Crow magazine, published at New Haven, Conn. Ives naturally is quite excited because exactly 100 years ago this Nation had its first poultry show.

Want to talk about progress? Want to talk about tremendous achievements? Well, then, talk about chickens.

LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

"Like many other immigrants," says the Department of Agriculture in a tribute to its feathered friends, "the modern chicken has found the United States a land of opportunity."

And indeed it has. Few chickens ever think much about it now, but their ancestors came from the jungles—from New Guinea, Java, and Malaya.

They were taken to Europe, and from there to the American colonies.

SOME FEATHERY FACTS

And now for some feathery facts:

Farmers get $3,000,000,000 from their chicken crop each year.

Like a mattress tester, a hen can get ahead by laying down on the job. But she once figured that 86 eggs were a year's work. The average now has been boosted to 113, and in good flocks smart clucks do twice that well.

A gizzard has nothing to do with a chicken's digestion. A rooster had one removed, felt fine, lived four more years.

An eating chicken soon may be built to specifications. A national grocery company decided it wanted an ideal chicken, and offered a reward for same.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue, during 1948, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

In the opinion of the committee, wherein there was unanimous approval, this industry, which has made such rapid progress and which constitutes such an important segment of our economic life, merits this recognition.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in favor of House Joint Resolution 246, submitted by my colleague, ANTONI N. SADLAK, calling for the issuance of a special stamp by the Post Office Department in commemoration of the one hundredth birthday anniversary of the poultry business in the United States. A hundred years ago the oldest poultry show in the world started in Boston and there the interest in poultry was born which has grown throughout the years and developed this gigantic industry. It produced nearly $3,000,000,000 during 1946 in the United States. Among all farm interests it is exceeded only by the great dairy interest. In Connecticut it heads the list of all industries by a wide margin. As an old poultryman myself, and a life long friend of Paul Ives, editor of Cackle and Crow, one of the leading poultry papers in the United States, who is also chairman of the show committee for the one hundredth Boston poultry show, I wholeheartedly support this legislation.

The joint resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING SUPPORT FOR WOOL

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee I call up House Resolution 315, providing for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of S. 1498, which is a bill to support the price of wool until December 31, 1948.

This is an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any extended explanation of this bill is necessary. We have had wool legislation before us previously this year. A similar bill passed the House on May 23. It was vetoed by the President on June 26. On the same day the Senate passed this bill before us today.

The first bill contained a provision which was objectionable to the President. I think the President should have signed the first bill. However, if we are going to continue the price-support program for wool we must pass this bill. I do not like it as well as the first bill, but we have no alternative.

The purpose of this bill is to direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue the wool price-support program that expired on April 15, 1947. Since that date the Government has not supported the price of wool. I understand some of the finer grades of wool have been selling at good prices and there has been a ready market for the same. However, the cheaper grades of wool have not been moving and there will be no market for these types of wool until this legislation is passed.

The bill also provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell the wool purchased in previous years and now on hand. It is estimated there are about 460,000,000 pounds of this wool. Up to now this wool could not be sold in competition with foreign wool for the reason that the Commodity Credit Corporation was not permitted to sell below the parity price. Since this price was above the prices quoted on foreign wool there was no opportunity to dispose of the same. This bill removes all restrictions, and this wool can now be sold.

If the bill previously passed by the Congress had become a law this wool could have been sold without any loss to the Government. That bill provided for quotas and import fees on foreign wool in the discretion of the President. In that manner we could have sold this large stock pile of wool and sustained no loss. This bill contains no such provision. I hope we can dispose of this wool with little loss, but we could have avoided any loss whatever if the President had signed the bill passed by this House 2 months ago.

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

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I take this opportunity to go on record at this point as being utterly opposed to this legislation or legislation of a similar character.

Mr. CHENOWETH. May I say to my good friend from New Jersey that the time is here when we must pay a little more attention to some of our domestic industries in this country. Otherwise, we will become entirely dependent upon foreign nations for our supply of strategic raw materials, whether it be wool or some other commodity. Surely we learned the value of domestic industries during the war when foreign imports of many items were stopped.

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

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say apropos of the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey that if the wool industry does not get this help he might as well kiss the American wool industry good-by.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill. It has passed the Senate and I hope it will be passed by the House without amendment so that it can be sent direct to the White House. I urge the adoption of the rule and the passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, after the rule is adopted there will be general debate, but no vote will be taken on the bill this evening. I am not going to deviate from my policy of not opposing a rule on a bill that has been reported after consideration by a legislative committee. I feel, however, this is another bill which will add additional costs and burdens upon the American consumer and the American people.

I fully appreciate the position of the wool growers in the West. In fact, as I have often said before, I am deeply interested in their welfare. So, of course, are the manipulators who make fortunes by manipulating the wool supplies, and who are interested in this bill because it calls for Government support of wool prices—in fact, it has been estimated that this bill will tax the American people from $100,000,000 to $200,000,000 annually for the benefit of those who buy and sell wool, though it will do little enough for the herders and the shearers and the workers.

ANOTHER SUBSIDY

It is another disguised subsidy to the wool growers to guarantee them continued high profits and benefits. It is an unending source of amazement to me to see how these industrialists and their highly paid lobbies can get anything they want from this Republican Congress, always at the expense of the consumers, the workers, and the taxpayers. Since the infamous political coalition of the Seventy-ninth Congress was formed, and now with an overwhelming Republican majority in both Houses of Congress, there is not even any effective opposition or criticism of this lobbyists' steam roller.

The only redeeming feature of this bill, as I view it, is that it will permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell any or all of the 460,000,000 pounds of wool owned now by the Government, which may help to clothe the world, and which the British wool combine through various tricks and artifices has been able to tie up, notwithstanding that we produce only about one-third of the wool we use each year.

THE WAR IS OVER NOW

This was done with the knowing connivance of American manufacturers and traders, and again shows how selfish our own industrialists and merchants can be, and how they retard the progress of our country and go against the welfare and interest of the consumers by maintaining outrageously high prices without any justification.

I concede that during the war Congress passed a wool subsidy act to insure the production of a sufficient quantity of wool to meet our domestic and military needs and even provided that prices should be frozen for 2 years after the war.

But the war is over and has been for 2 years. We have kept faith with the wool producers. They and the manufacturers have been the beneficiaries of the Government bounty to the disadvantage of the people.

What I say about wool applies equally to all other commodities. I wonder how long the American people will continue to be bled.

I fully appreciate that many of the Members who favor this legislation are my personal friends, for whom I have a high regard; but when we are acting on legislation which affects all the people we should not permit personal friendships to affect or corrupt our judgments. We must take into consideration the needs and wishes of the people.

The President vetoed the first wool bill because of its bad effect on the economy; but so far as I am concerned I cannot see that this bill offers any improvement in its protection to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, when the iniquitous loyalty bill was rigged for passage by the superpatriots and witch hunters of the House who are not satisfied with the thoroughness of the regulations promulgated by Executive order to root out disloyal Communists and parlor pinks, I shuddered at the thought of the humiliation of the countless thousands of faithful and devoted Government employees, loyal to their job and more so to their beloved country, who will be forced to go through third-degree examinations in order to retain their jobs. The distinguished, able, and trustworthy columnist, Lowell Mellett, known for fairness, liberality, and searching scrutiny, treats the recent and unwarranted action of the House so comprehensively and honestly that I felt I could do no better than to avail myself of his eloquence by reading into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his comments published in the Washington Star of Tuesday, July 22. His opinion and expressions coincide with my views and sentiments.

ON THE OTHER HAND—CONGRESS MAY DO THE UNFORGIVABLE IN SEEKING TO ENFORCE LOYALTY BY LAW

(By Lowell Mellett)

In an attempt to do the impossible, Congress may do the unforgivable. The House already has done its worst—but lack of time is likely to prevent the Senate from following suit immediately.

The House seeks to enforce loyalty by law. The Members who voted to do this will tell

you this is not quite true, that all they seek to do is to make sure that no disloyal persons shall have employment in the Government.

To this end all persons about to be employed, as well as the hundreds of thousands already employed, would be given searching examinations as to their loyalty. The business would start with the Civil Service Commission looking over its own files and fingerprints and then proceeding to the records of the FBI, the Army and Navy, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, local law enforcement agencies and any other sources that might occur to anybody.

If somewhere along the line something "derogatory" should be turned up—such as somebody making serious but unsupported charges against the man or woman under consideration—the name would be certified to the FBI for a full-fledged investigation. The result of this investigation would be presented to a Federal Loyalty Board, created by the act. This board would decide whether the employee or candidate for a job was loyal. If not found loyal, he would be fired or not hired.

DEFENSE HOBBLED

The Board would make its decision on evidence—but the accused person would not see or hear the evidence. He could have counsel, but the counsel could not confront his accusers, subpena witnesses or cross-examine any witness.

The man or woman found guilty of "disloyalty" through this utterly unfair and un-American process would be branded for life. He would find it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain other employment. The man or woman found "loyal" would, in many instances, be in no better situation. The very fact that he or she had been subjected to suspicion and dragged through such proceedings would leave its stigma, a smear that would stick.

That is the unforgivable thing the House is willing to do. And, as said, it is also attempting the impossible.

Loyalty is a state of mind and heart. It is a matter of the spirit. The same is true of disloyalty. Overt disloyalty or treason is a crime and punishable as such. Like every other country, we have plenty of law for that. But only the Japanese, in the heydey of their military men, could conceive of "thought police" as a means of reaching the impure mind. Only the Japanese—until the present strange hysteria hit the House.

It is to be hoped that this hysteria will subside before Congress comes back in January. If it doesn't get better, it may get worse. We may find Federal employees compelled to take new and fearsome oaths, written in their own blood, as a requisite for serving Uncle Sam.

TO HARM INNOCENT

Yet, loyalty will remain a matter of spirit, with no man able to say who does and who does not possess it. You may feel that any man who volunteered in the last war and offered his life in defense of his country had loyalty beyond questioning. But it won't be beyond questioning if he applies for a Government job.

You may have other odd ideas about loyalty. You may think the Members of the House owe a certain amount of loyalty to these same veterans—owe them some loyal assistance or protection in the matter of housing, for example. Many Members, however, including some who voted for this loyalty bill, have a different notion on that subject. Their loyalty has gone instead to the real estate interests.

Loyalty is, indeed, a thing difficult to get at. The House is attempting to get at it in the worst possible way. And, in the process, it is certain to do grievous harm to many innocent persons.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, there are several things that have happened since this matter was debated by the House some months ago. In the first place the previous bill that passed the House was vetoed by the President. In the second place, the market for wool and particularly fine wool, has strengthened very materially, so that the sales of the finer wools in this country that have been made during the period of the past few months have averaged in price from 5 to 9 cents above the support price provided for in this bill. The poorer grade wool, however, is not moving effectively, largely for the reason that the mills have not known whether or not under some such legislation as this the Commodity Credit Corporation will be disposing of its surplus stocks of inferior grade wools at a price which would very much affect the general market.

I realize that the hour is very late, and I am only taking this very brief time now to put into the RECORD an amendment which I shall offer to this bill when it comes up for amendment, which I understand will not be tonight but tomorrow. That amendment is a very simple one. Instead of fixing the support price at a definite figure which could not change regardless of what happens to other commodities or to our economy in general, I am going to move that the words "at the price it supported wool in 1946" be stricken out and that in lieu thereof there be substituted "at a price not less than 90 percent of parity."

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

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is that not the same language that the gentleman offered when the original wool bill was before the House?

Mr. HERTER. No; it is not the same amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the difference?

Mr. HERTER. The amendment I offered before was at 90 percent of parity. It could not have been fixed higher than that. I am offering tomorrow "at not less than 90 percent of parity" so that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation can fix it at a higher price if they see fit. That is the formula that has applied to agricultural products. The gentleman's own Committee on Agriculture reported a bill this week dealing with milk prices in which exactly the same formula applies, and it still allows the Commodity Credit Corporation to fix the price higher than 90 percent of parity if it thinks such a price is justified. It is like the Steagall amendment. It is exactly like every other commodity.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that back on March 11, 1946, President Truman addressed a letter to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY in regard to the wool situation, and I would like to read that letter, if I may:

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: On January 5, 1946, you sent me a memorandum on wool in accordance with a suggestion I had made to you at a conference on the subject. In your memorandum you suggested that I request the interested agencies of the Government to confer and to prepare a wool program. Such a program has now been prepared and is attached. It represents the considered views of the administration on the best methods for solving a serious and difficult problem.

Your committee will, of course, be able to call on the interested agencies for any desired assistance in your further studies of the wool situation or in drafting appropriate legislation.

I trust that the Congress will find that this proposed wool program constitutes a sound and adequate basis for constructive legislation.

In closing I wish to express my agreement with you that cooperation between the Executive and the Congress is essential to the establishment of an effective wool program.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

In the attached statement the administration and the agencies' interest recognize the fact that parity on wool is not fair and this is the language pertinent to parity as it affects wool.

1. The parity price of wool be revised or established at the so-called comparable level so that wool parity prices will be on a level equivalent to parity prices for other farm products.

In other words, for some reason the administration and the agencies affected consider 90 percent of parity for wool producers as inadequate protection to the wool growers of the country.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Of course, if we had adopted the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, we would never have had this controversy at all. What the gentleman says is the meat of the whole controversy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this is mighty poor legislation. It is nothing but a subsidy bill. It also puts the Government into business to buy all the wool in the country from now on until December 31, 1948. It pays the highest price for wool that we paid in 27 years, and guarantees it with money we will have to take out of the Treasury. We now have 400,000,000 pounds of wool in the stock pile, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is supposed to sell it.

They have to sell it before December 31, 1948, and take any loss that might come to the Treasury. If you are going to pass legislation like this it seems to

me we are on the wrong track. Another thing, it gives permission for the President and the State Department to reduce the tariff which is now on scoured wools of 34 cents a pound. If the farmers of this country cannot get along on the price they have now, what are they going to do when you reduce the tariff? It is poor legislation. You ought not to vote for it at all.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thought I heard the gentleman mention something about the tariff. How does the gentleman feel about reducing the tariff on woolen textiles?

Mr. RICH. I do not want to reduce it on anything. If you reduce the tariff on any commodity in this country, whereby you wreck the woolen manufacturers, the farmers, the sheep growers, and the labor of this country, I am against it. I have always been against it and I always will be against it. The Republican Party has always been for a high tariff, and it has made this country the greatest country on earth. Do you think I am going to stand for something of that kind? Not on your tintype. I am not built that way.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, possible abuses of retirement privileges by officer personnel are bringing serious criticisms upon the War and Navy Departments of our Government. In the War Department in the period May 1, 1945, to December 31, 1946, I find that 1,283 Regular Army officers were retired for physical disability. For all other reasons only 408 were retired during this period. That means three out of four were found physically disabled by examining boards.

In the Navy, during the period May 1, 1945, to May 1, 1947, I am advised that 2,864 were retired for physical disability, and only 732 for all other reasons. Here the ratio of retirements for physical disability is nearly 4 to 1.

Since these appear to be disturbing figures, I have secured from official Government sources figures for comparison on the number of physically disabled persons in civilian life. Having noted that the greater number of retirements for physical disability are in the grades of general officer or colonel in the Army, and that a large number of Navy physical disability retirements are in proportionate grades, I assume that we may safely consider only ages 35 to 64.

And here is what we find in civilian life: Two percent of the males in ages 35 to 44 are physically disabled, 3.7 percent of those in ages 45 to 54, 6.4 percent in ages 55 to 59, and 12.1 percent in ages 60 to 64. Yet in the services the percentages of those retired for physical disability runs 75 percent or more among the men retired in the camparable colonel-general age brackets. And the fact has been brought out that many high-ranking officers who retired from the services as physically disabled went immediately into industry at very lucrative salaries.

Now what can be the reason for this condition? How has the percentage of physically disabled reached such alarming heights among officer personnel? Who makes up the retiring boards, and on what basis do they judge physical-disability standards?

It is true that personnel retired for physical disabilities draw in some instances higher retirement pay than they would draw for length-of-service retirement. And it is true that physical disability retirement pay is not subject to income tax. It is likewise true that retirement pay for length of service is in only a very few cases higher than disability-retirement pay. But these should not be deciding factors.

I make no accusations at this time. I simply call attention to the facts, for I find them disturbing. I think this matter should receive serious thought from the membership of the Congress during the period prior to our reconvening in January. A request has been made by the House Committee on Armed Services, partly at my suggestion, that the services provide us with full and accurate information on this subject during that period, and that careful attention be given to correcting abuses if abuses exist.

In the belief that it may prove interesting, I file herein a table of retirements by officers of the Regular Army. I regret that I have not been furnished a similar table for naval officer personnel.

Retirements of Regular Army commissioned officers, May 1, 1945, to Dec. 31, 1946

Grade	Physical disability	Other retirements (age or service)	Wholly retired [1]	Total
General of the Army	1			1
General		1		1
Lieutenant general	8	3		11
Major general	136	28		164
Brigadier general	160	47		207
Colonel	831	287		1,118
Lieutenant colonel	91	38	1	130
Major	31	3	1	35
Captain	16	1		17
First lieutenant	9			9
Second lieutenant			1	1
Total	1,283	408	3	1,691

[1] Do not receive retired pay.

On Jan 1, 1947, 5,701 commissioned officers of the Regular Army received retired pay.

NOTE.—Non-Regular officers are not placed on the Regular Army retired list. They are certified to the Veterans' Administration for retirement. From Dec. 31, 1941, through Dec. 28, 1946, 26,056 were so certified. May 7, 1945, through Jan. 3, 1947, 18,525 were so certified.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Has the gentleman obtained similar information with regard to the retirement for disability of Reserve officers, in comparison with retirement for disability of Regular officers?

Mr. SIKES. I do have some information on that but I do not have as complete information on it as I do for the Regular officers. I find that the percentage of Reserve officers who have been retired for physical disability is very small in comparison with the over-all number, and that of the number of Reserve officers who are examined for physical disability by examining boards only about one-third or less are retired. By comparison it is my understanding that nearly all of the Regular Army officers who are examined for physical disability by examining boards are retired for physical disability.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not that a rather strange situation?

Mr. SIKES. I find it so.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking with regard to the wool bill. Hold your hats, taxpayers, you are about to be taken for another ride.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1498, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been thoroughly discussed on previous occasions, and I am not going to take very much time at this late hour of the day for a general discussion of the subject.

I am taking these few minutes to call attention to the fact that the bill which is now before us is identical with the bill which passed both Houses and was vetoed by the President except for the fact that section 4 which provided for the imposition of import fees and quotas under the provisions of section 32 of the AAA Act has been eliminated.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to section 4 which was stricken out of the bill. Is it not a fact that the authority conferred under section 4 was a discretionary power in the hands of the President as to whether or not he wanted to impose import fees or a quota?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; it was the same provision which has been applicable at one time or another to something like 40 different agricultural commodities. It vested in the President power and authority to make investigations and determine whether or not support-price programs on agricultural commodities were being interfered with by reason of imports. The provision as to wool simply put it on the same basis as other agricultural commodities which come under the provision of section 22.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. A good many of the newspapers and editorial writers have said that legislation provided for an increase in the duty on wool, and I would like to have the gentleman make it plain that it did no such thing and there was no increase authorized in the duty on wool in that bill.

Mr. HOPE. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because he is absolutely right in his statement that the bill in itself did not provide for any increase in duties. I might say that in all the time that I have been a Member of Congress I cannot recall any bill which was so persistently misrepresented in the press, especially in editorial columns, as the wool bill which passed the House and was vetoed by the President. I am not blaming the press so much for that misrepresentation as I blame the State Department for passing out information which constituted misrepresentation as to the character and purpose of the legislation. But I do not want to spend any more time going into that particular phase of the matter.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The bill reported by the House certainly authorized the President to increase the tariff to the extent of 50 percent, did it not?

Mr. HOPE. It gave the President the authority that he now has as to a number of other commodities, to either impose a quota or an import fee which would be in effect an increase in the tariff under certain conditions, if certain findings were made and he decided to use his discretion and found it was necessary to do that in order to prevent the support-price program from being interfered with.

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is that my distinguished colleague very studiously refrained from confessing that the President was ever to exercise his discretion in that certain situation to which the gentleman has referred. Some of the Members said it was a discretionary matter with the President. I took the position at that time, and I still think I was correct in saying that it was not discretionary with the President if the findings justified and indicated the necessity for an increased duty.

Mr. HOPE. Of course, it was necessary for the President to make a determination based upon the findings of fact. That determination was based upon whether or not he concluded that the imports were interfering with the support-price program. That was a matter that necessarily must have been left to his discretion.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, and that is the only discretion he had to exercise. Now, after having asked the Tariff Commission to make an investigation and then report back to him, if they indicated that the imports were interfering with the domestic program he had no alternative other than to impose it at that time.

Mr. HOPE. No. It was still up to the President, in the exercise of his discretion and judgment, to determine whether or not, based upon the information furnished by the Tariff Commission, imports were interfering with the support-price program.

Mr. COOLEY. But he had to make his determination based upon the findings of fact, and if the findings of fact indicated no other alternative, he had to make it?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, but he had to make the determination. It was not automatic.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In the first place, it was discretionary on the part of the President to ask the Tariff Commission to make the investigation.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree that is the only discretion he had.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Afterward he had to concur in the findings of the Tariff Commission, and if he did not find that the facts submitted by the Tariff Commission were in accordance with his views, it was discretionary with him whether or not he wanted to exercise his power.

Mr. COOLEY. It would not have been a question of being in accord with his views, but in accord with the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. It seems to me also that under section 4 the President could only impose such fees as would bring the price of foreign wool up to the price wool is supported under the wool program. Is that not true?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is correct.

Now, I do not want to get into any further discussion of the provisions of the other bill, because that is water over the dam. The President vetoed the bill. The Congress did not override the veto. While I think the other method of approaching the problem was preferable, we were not successful in solving it that way, and we are now coming here with what I think is the second best way of affording a price-support program for wool.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. I am wondering whether the gentleman can advise me whether he would accept an amendment. Instead of 90 percent of parity it could be fixed at a higher price, if the Secretary of Agriculture or the Commodity Credit Corporation so desired.

Mr. HOPE. No. I do not believe I would be in a position to accept that amendment.

It has already been brought to the attention of the committee that the parity price on wool does not at this time reflect a fair relationship as between wool and other farm commodities or a fair relationship with the cost of production, and for that reason among others, I do not believe that I could consistently agree to the amendment suggested.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not true that the Commodity Credit Corporation today is supporting certain commodities at higher than 90 percent of parity? For instance, cotton is being supported at 92½ percent and some commodities at a higher price because of the necessity of stimulating production. Would not the gentleman be willing to look to the same people who have discretion in all Steagall commodities to determine what is the proper price above 90 percent of parity to make the same determination in the case of wool?

Mr. HOPE. The support price of wool which we are asking in this bill is the same support price that has prevailed since 1943. Practically all other prices are now far higher than they were in 1943. I do not believe that it is out of the way to urge that the 1943 price should be continued. I realize that the gentleman's amendment does not necessarily reduce the rate at which the price would be supported, but it would give authority to support the price at a lower rate, which I do not believe would be desirable at this time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The only thing "comparable price" means is that wool would then be given the same treatment that other agricultural commodities enjoy under the parity formula of the Steagall amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; as a matter of fact we are not stabilizing the price of wool at the comparable price. There are some other commodities in the same situation as wool where the Department of Agriculture has determined a comparable price and use that for stabilization purposes. But that is not true of wool. If that provision were in the bill it would result in a price 4 or 5 cents higher than the price now contained in the bill.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. The bill now before us is the Senate bill and has passed the Senate.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. JENNINGS. Should it be amended it would then go to conference and in this jam we are in there would be very little probability of its becoming law at all.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman has raised a very good point and one to which we

must give consideration in this late stage of the session, because unless the bill can be passed in its present form it certainly is very doubtful as to whether it can become law at this session.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman will remember, of course, that the original O'Mahoney bill regarding which the gentleman from North Carolina read a letter from the President to Senator O'MAHONEY, contains the very thing we are talking about here, a comparable price. We were trying to change the formula that put wool on a parity with other commodities. Is not that true?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. GRANGER. And as to the comparable price some of the members of our committee did not want to go along with it. This is the compromise. This is the only thing that has ever been found which would meet the issue. We might just as well not pass this bill if we accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts because that is the reason the bill was introduced in the first place.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I agree with the gentleman. I appreciate the contribution he has made by calling attention to that fact.

Just briefly in conclusion I wish to bring the attention of the committee to the fact that the situation has changed somewhat as to wool prices in recent weeks.

There has been a stiffening of the price as far as the better grades are concerned, as stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts. That is fortunate in that those grades have been selling higher than the support price would have been and there has been that much more wool on the open market. We want all of the wool to go to the market place that can possibly go there. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been able to sell some of its stocks of wool because the better grades have gone above the parity price. That is all to the good, and we are glad that is the situation because it means that in the end this operation is not going to be as costly to the Government as it would be otherwise. It means that the loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation is going to be less but it does not in any way lessen the need for this legislation because we do not know what the market may be or where it may go between now and December 31, 1948, at which time this program will end. The Army, so I am told, wants to take some of the stock pile of the Commodity Credit Corporation and, of course, that will help in the liquidation and will cut down the loss that will be sustained on account of this liquidation. So I think those who have been fearful of the cost that might accrue under this legislation can vote for this bill with the assurance that a change in conditions has reduced the probable cost considerably.

I hope that the committee will approve the bill without amendment and that we can send it to the President in the form in which it was passed by the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this whole matter has been debated on the floor formerly and I think every Member is acquainted with the provisions of the present bill. It has been passed by the Senate. There is no question in the world, in the event we give favorable consideration to the bill, but what the President will approve the legislation. It is absolutely necessary to protect the wool industry in America. There is no other way around. I do not think the membership of this House wants to put the great wool industry out of business.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not get this legislation we are not going to get any legislation at all. It is up to us to make that determination here and now. The committee is in possession of all the facts in connection with the whole situation; therefore I do not see any necessity for prolonging the discussion. We are only attempting to give the wool grower the same treatment that the producers of other agricultural commodities received under what is known as the Steagall amendment, a fair price. A parity price to the wool growers under the parity formula is not a fair price. That is the reason this legislation changes the parity formula with respect to wool. It is just simply doing justice to the wool growers of America.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I favor this measure and I favor it for the benefit of the wool growers of the entire Nation and particularly of my own State. Its enactment will be in simple justice to them. But there is another group dependent upon us in this matter of the price of wool.

I would like to say this: in addition to the white men there are in my State about 60,000 Navajo Indians and others who are nomadic, living upon their sheep, and the price of wool means everything in their economy. They are hard pressed now and up against the limit of subsistence. So, I am thinking in behalf of the 60,000 Navajo and Hopi Indians who produce wool and depend upon it for their very living. It is even better to give them a fair price than to furnish them charity. They prefer it rather than charity.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Some of the statements which have been made during the debate on this matter might indicate or tend to indicate that this support program was not needed. As the gentleman has pointed out, we are faced with a situation that we either take this bill or no bill at all. Now, if we have no bill at all, its natural result might be that the market for wool at present levels might go to pieces.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And I think it would go to pieces.

Mr. COOLEY. Because we have a tremendous surplus hanging over the market at the present time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And I think it will take this legislation to give the wool growers of America reasonable protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Veterans' Affairs has worked diligently and I want to report to the House that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has reported five bills we believe should pass, the President and his Budget Bureau notwithstanding. But to date the veterans' legislation Congress has passed has amounted to very little, because the insurance time-extension bill simply gives the veterans a chance to apply for insurance. It is a commercial matter. The veterans pay for it. It should not be called a benefit, in fact. The House has one very important bill—the Patterson bill—which would give service presumption to chronic and tropical diseases.

This bill has passed the other body. I want to bring to the attention of the House again that if we do not pass the Senate bill which is now on the Speaker's desk, which gives the blind, the double arm amputees, and the double leg amputees automobiles, we are depriving the men, the most seriously wounded, of transportation that they can use in securing jobs. There are only 12,000 affected. They are the last ones of the group that are always classed together for rating purposes. The cost would not be great and would cover a period of 3 years. I know no Member wants to go back to his district and face a blind boy, when a boy with a leg off or a boy with both legs off can get an automobile, and say, "You cannot. The Congress did not choose to give you a car; it was not willing to do it." The bill was discriminatory last year. This rectifies that.

We passed other legislation out of our committee, Mr. Speaker, that is vitally needed. I do not know how the Members can go back and I do not know how I can go back and tell the veterans of various organizations where I have been asked to speak in the hospitals and say, "No, the Congress has passed millions and millions of dollars for relief to foreign countries and never counted the cost, but we are not passing legislation for the veterans because of the cost."

The Congress cashed the terminal-leave-pay bonds for the able-bodied, but did nothing additional for the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, there is other much-needed legislation already passed by the other body which is on the Speaker's desk, legislation which your committee on veterans' legislation passed first but which has not been acted upon by the House. The other body passed the on-the-job training bill, the subsistence-allowance bill, the bill for increased allowances for disabled taking vocational training, the amputee-car bill and the institutional farm-training bill which the House already has passed.

I believe the leadership will bring up those bills for action tomorrow. I still have faith. I do not believe that faith will be betrayed.

Six months, when the House will reconvene, will be too late for the men and women in school and in training.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object to this request, but I want to serve notice at this time that I shall object to any other requests to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the statement made by the very able gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I am in full accord with her that there has not been very important legislation concerning veterans passed by this body, and we would be sorely remiss in our duties to the veterans if we did not fully enact legislation that has been recently passed by the Senate.

Yesterday afternoon I called the attention of this body to a bill, S. 1394, which was passed by the Senate unanimously and now is languishing in a committee in this body. I was much surprised today when the majority leader issued his statement to this body in which he quoted from the President's speech of last January 6. The majority leader said:

> That statement can leave no question about the opposition of President Truman to additional veterans' legislation of any consequence.

I say that is not true. The President has yet to veto any bill concerning veterans' legislation which has been passed by this Congress. I am confident that he will not veto the type of veterans' legislation having senatorial approval. If the legislation the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has spoken to you about, including S. 1394, passes this body there will be no Presidential veto. Of that I am confident. If we adopt and approve these bills which the Senate has passed unanimously, there will be no Presidential veto.

Let me tell you what I suspect is the real motive behind the majority leader's remarks. For some unknown reason the Republican leadership of this body is attempting to avoid the consequences of bottling up veterans' legislation. It is common knowledge that they will not permit S. 1394 and other measures recently passed by the Senate to come before this body for action. Now there is great demand for this legislation. Disabled war veterans need the assistance provided by some of these bills, and particularly in S. 1394 thousands upon thousands of veterans have been pressing for an increase in their subsistence allowance in order to meet the continued rise in the cost of living.

The majority leader, in the prepared speech before this body today, has expressed deep concern over the possibility of a Presidential veto of additional veterans' legislation. I cannot understand, at this late date, his solicitude about a Presidential veto. Certainly such concern was not manifest with regard to other important measures which have been passed through this body under the guiding hand of the Republican leadership. I refer now to the Taft-Hartley bill and to the tax bills. I suggest to the majority leader that the proper way to place the onus on the executive branch of the Government is to give it an opportunity to perform its function. Bring these important veteran bills before this Congress. Let us perform our legislative function under the Constitution and then let the record clearly show whether or not the President will veto these extremely important measures. The responsibility for the passage of these measures is directly that of the majority party and its leadership. No searching and grasping from disconnected portions of the President's speech of last January can relieve the majority leadership of this body from its responsibility.

Again, I agree with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that this is a part of the unfinished business of this Congress and in good conscience we cannot face our veterans at home unless we act now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Commodity Credit Corporation shall continue, until December 31, 1948, to support a price to producers of wool in the continental United States and Territories at the price it supported wool in 1946.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions hereof, the Commodity Credit Corporation may adjust support prices for individual grades and qualities of wool for the purpose of bringing about a fair and equitable relationship in the support prices for the various grades and qualities of wool; and may make discounts from support prices for off-quality, inferior-grade, or poorly prepared wool.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Governor Thurmond, of South Carolina, at the governors' conference in Salt Lake City.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special order heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—LAWRENCE MICHAEL AGAINST HOWARD W. SMITH

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1947.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The motion to dismiss of the contestee in the contested-election case of Lawrence Michael against HOWARD W. SMITH for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Virginia, filed in this office July 25, 1947, is transmitted herewith for reference to the appropriate committee.

Yours respectfully,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

AMENDING NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 4395 to amend the National Housing Act to increase insurance on FHA title VI loans.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NO. 1 FAILURE OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—SUBSERVIENCE TO THE REAL-ESTATE LOBBY

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, in March of 1946 the Chicago Daily News printed a dispatch from Washington which gladdened the hearts of the members of one of the most powerful lobbies operating at present in this country. The headline said, "How lobby helped weaken housing bill."

The story read in part:

> The housing bill passed the House this week with the guts cut out of it—and it was a luncheon club that did the gutting.
>
> Sitting around a luncheon table, Washington secretaries of construction trade associations decided they didn't like the idea of price ceilings on old houses or subsidies to stimulate building-material production.
>
> So they went to work, and soon every Member of the House was getting telegrams from lumber dealers, contractors, real-estate firms, builders, and architects in his district.

Then the story quotes Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, as follows:

> "We've got a gang in power who think solely of the consumer and usually in terms of 'protecting' him," said Nelson.

He was referring to the Democratic administration, which was launching an aggressive emergency housing program in the early months of 1946.

From the warped viewpoint of the real-estate lobby, protecting the consumer is a bad thing. They schemed cleverly to end this protection, but could not overcome the Democratic administration backed up by the Democratic Congress.

That was in 1946, prior to November 6.

Sure the Democratic Party wants to protect the consumer, and we were proud of it.

But the Republican Party came into control of Congress in the fluke elections of '46 and the real-estate lobby has literally "gone to town."

Six weeks before the session opened the president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards told members to wait for the new Congress on the Capitol steps with a proposal for a cushioned decontrol of rents.

Cushioned decontrol of rents is a nice way of saying "Let us get rid of the protection that keeps the consumer from being at the mercy of greedy landlords."

Under the pretext of extending rent control, a bill was finally passed which I termed "a monstrosity." It was in committee when I first saw this strange creature known as the Housing and Rent Act of 1947—H. R. 3203.

Actually, this bill killed the existing emergency program to get housing for veterans. It was supposed to remove all the restrictions on commercial building. Restrictions that had been put in to give builders of living places for veterans a chance to compete against money-heavy commercial and industrial builders for scarce building materials.

The real-estate profiteers and speculators are doing very well under the existing housing shortage, and profits are much higher in commercial construction than in home building, so big business did not like the provisions that held it back to let home building go ahead faster.

The real-estate lobby cracked its whip and the Republican majority in Congress jumped through the hoop.

The result: Congress enacted a hodgepodge and a monstrosity known as the Housing and Rent Control Act of 1947.

Of course, the nastiest thing about this bill was the cruel joker provision which gave landlords the right to extract a 15-percent rent increase from helpless tenants. It gave tenants the choice of going for the 15-percent jump now or really getting blackjacked later on. In effect, it has been misnamed a "voluntary agreement."

Many helpless tenants really know what it means by now.

This bill was delayed in the other body until late in the session and then sent to the White House as part of a carefully laid political scheme.

If the President did not sign this phony bill, which gives a little protection to the consumer, the Republicans said brazenly they would pass no rent control law.

So the question was whether it was better to protect the consumer at least to the extent of some curb on landlords' greed or whether to have no law and put all tenants completely at the mercy of property owners at once.

Of course, neither choice was a good one. But the President decided wisely that a little protection for the consumer was better than none, so he signed the bill after issuing a blistering statement castigating the real-estate lobby and pointing out the evils of this bill.

I said this was part of a well-planned political scheme. It was. The Republicans deliberately held off the choice of a bad bill or no rent control bill at all until too late in the session for a better law to be pushed through before the old one expired.

Like the wolf in Little Red Riding Hood, the real-estate lobby said that nobody needed to be afraid of them because landlords wouldn't take unfair advantage of the privileges they were given under this bill.

Well, hotel rooms rented on a monthly basis were freed from rent control under this bill. Hotel operators around the country promptly dropped the mask of being grandma and stood revealed as the ravenous wolf.

Rates were increased as high as 200 percent. Even flophouse rates soared upward in an inflationary spiral. It was plain that the same thing would have happened to other tenants without the meager protection they receive under this bill.

This breaking of its promise is typical of the performance of the real-estate lobby.

Last year the real-estate lobby said in canned news releases that elimination of price controls would speed construction of homes and lower the cost of homes.

So price controls were removed. Prices of homes soared skyward. The veteran making $40 or $50 a week had a fine selection of homes—jerry-built crackerboxes—that he could buy for from eight, or nine, or ten thousand dollars.

That was the lower costs that the real-estate lobby promised. But the real-estate lobby is not much interested in the people who do not have seven or eight thousand dollars lying around in loose cash.

The real-estate lobby's promise to solve the housing problem if government controls were removed stands today as a cruel mockery to the homeless veteran—as cruel as its repeated statements that there is no housing shortage.

Yes, the real-estate lobby actually makes that argument. They say there is no housing shortage. They say it is just overconsumption of existing space. Look what we are doing now? Have you seen the figures for June 1947?

The real-estate lobby has a simple solution to this so-called overconsumption of existing space. They would just raise rents so that families would have to move into smaller quarters and then all the folks with plenty of dough would then have nice places to live in.

Of course, it might be a little uncomfortable for a veteran and his wife and baby to have to live in one room instead of two or three, but the real-estate lobby does not worry about that—any more than they worry about being trapped in untrue promises of reducing building costs and meeting the needs of veterans.

In Mein Kampf, Adolf Hitler gave his theory of propaganda. It was to pick a big lie and keep repeating it. If you repeated it long enough, Hitler believed, you would get the people to believe it.

Apparently Hitler's theory has not gone unnoticed in this country, or has it?

Recently in headlines, the weekly publication of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, Mr. Herbert U. Nelson, the lobbying gentleman we mentioned earlier, wrote as follows:

> The realtor who sells homes in our country can certainly offer the best buy in the world today and in all history.

This unbelievable brazenness shows how little the real-estate lobby cares for the homeless veteran and how much it cares for the blood money that can be extorted during the present housing shortage from homeless veterans desperate for a place to live.

What a favor the pious talking real-estate lobbyists offer the veteran in "the best buy in the world today and in all history." The homeless veteran can buy a crackerbox worth $3,500 at most for only 8 or 9 or 10 thousand dollars or he can do without a decent place to live.

This is directly the result of the real-estate lobby's spectacular success in winning from the Republican Congress the

ending of the Democratic administration's housing program.

Small wonder that President Truman asked Congress to investigate this slick outfit. Small wonder that the Senator from Ohio, the Republican Party whipcracker in the other body, said that he would like to investigate the lobby. Brother, could we give it a whitewashing—and how.

In fact this lobby is so powerful that it continues to block passage of a housing bill of which the Senator from Ohio is one of the coauthors. This lobby is so slick and so brazen that one of its spokesmen said that because the Senator from Ohio had the temerity to cosponsor a bill to help build homes at decent prices and to help tear down the festering slums that bring such juicy rental returns, the lobby would block the Senator's Presidential ambitions for espousing such socialistic legislation.

Imagine a lobby that is able to be even more reactionary than the Senator from Ohio, who is now disclaiming having any part in writing the famous labor bill of 1947.

The Senator from Ohio would like to investigate the real-estate lobby—he says—but actually he knows that such an investigation would reveal the utter subservience of the Republican Congress to this lobby, so you may be sure that nothing will be done to expose this high-pressure group of vote swayers. A Democratic Senator introduced a resolution for the probe, but the Senator from Ohio did not give it the green light and so nothing happened. This was another victory for the real-estate lobby. Actually the record of the lobby's victories in this Congress is astounding.

Let us run down the complete list of what has been done to sabotage veterans' hopes for a home and to take a little more from you and me to fatten the pocketbooks of the landlords and rich contractors.

Here is a brief story of the sell-out of homeless veterans:

The so-called voluntary 15-percent rent increase hit millions of persons and added fire under the inflation boiler the Republicans are stoking so busily in their program of high prices and low wages. This unfair boost hits veterans and nonveterans alike, but the Republicans are more concerned with helping the rich get richer and the poor to the poorhouse.

The real-estate lobby won meat-ax cuts in appropriations for housing agencies and Federal aid to local low-cost housing programs. Veto by appropriation is what you call this, Mr. Majority Leader. I might say to the genial gentleman from Indiana, the majority leader, who so very frequently refers to the use of the Presidential veto, that your party has used a very effective and devious strategem—"Veto by appropriation."

The real-estate lobby won removal of the controls on nonhousing construction, giving the green light to builders of virtually everything but homes to go in and outbid home builders for scarce materials.

The real-estate lobby won approval by the House of the joker bill which calls for sale of 166,000 units of Government-owned housing for cash only. Real-estate profiteers have the ready cash, homeless veterans do not. Fortunately at present it is bottled up in the other body.

The real-estate lobby prevented passage of the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill to get housing in the price range of those who need it most.

And one outstanding thing that they did do in the other body was to approve the President's reorganization plan on housing and home financing. Where there is life there is hope.

A spokesman for the real-estate lobby has testified openly that the place for poor people to live is in the poorhouse. With the help of the Republican majority in Congress they will wind up by having even moderately well-to-do people living in miserable, inadequate housing.

The Republican majority in Congress and the real-estate lobby have not even bothered to try to hide their callous indifference to the welfare of the general public.

If homeless veterans and the millions of others who are not properly housed today do not go to the polls and vote for the Democratic program of decent housing for all, in 1948, we will continue to see the real-estate lobby rule Congress.

I, for one, do not believe that the veterans who defeated the powerful armies of Germany and Japan are going to let the real-estate lobby win this war.

The lobby has nothing but dollars on its side. The veterans have a weapon as strong as the bullets they used in the war—their ballot. Ballots can win the housing war.

Let us win it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress, first session, draws to a close. In the next few months the people of our Nation will have an opportunity to evaluate the accomplishments and lack of accomplishments of the past 6 months of Republican rule. The record has been written. The sins of commission and omission are clearly set forth. The people will be the final judge. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] said on April 15, during debate, "The Republican Party now has the responsibility for preparing and bringing legislation to this floor for action."

Now let us see what they have done and what they have left undone. Their sins of commission and omission are equally damnable.

HIGH PRICES

First, let us look at the high cost of living. The Republican leadership for over 2 years have been fighting all attempts at inflation control. They wrecked OPA last year with the promise that the law of supply and demand would bring prices down in a few months. Has the price of living come down? No. The cost of living is 17 percent higher today than it was in June 1946. This pleases the speculators and the profit hogs, but it does not please the people. And the Republicans have done nothing about the constantly rising cost of living.

TAXES

Now let us talk about taxes. With great fanfare, the Republican leadership has twice forced through the House a tax-reduction bill which gives a larger percentage of net take-home pay to the high-income individual than it does to the wage earner. Do not let them fool you with their phony percentages. The tax-cut bill was for the greedy and not for the needy.

At a time when our national debt was over $259,000,000,000, all thought is given to inflationary tax cuts, instead of the sound fiscal policy of paying our debts. The greedy with swollen incomes yell for the cut. But the President vetoed a cut at this time for the benefit of the people.

MINIMUM WAGES

Now let us look at minimum-wage legislation. The Republican leadership has been holding hearings on the minimum-wage bill. But I understand no action will be taken by this session of Congress.

They do not favor raising the 40-cent minimum wage to 60 cents per hour, which means raising wages from a paltry $3.20 a day to a subsistence wage of $4.80.

Some of the big low-wage industries do not want a $4.80 per day minimum wage for their employees, and they have flashed a red light to their Republican friends in the Eightieth Congress, and, of course, they have obeyed.

This pleases the low-wage-paying industrialist, but the people do not like it.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Now let us look at labor legislation. Yes; they have been successful in passing the Taft-Hartley bill, an omnibus antilabor bill which the Republican leadership promised would solve all industrial disputes.

Only a few days after this became the law of the land over the President's veto this law failed in its first big test. The coal miners struck. A half-million workers not only struck but they refused to sign a new contract binding them to the terms of the Taft-Hartley bill.

If the Taft-Hartley bill was what its sponsors claimed it was, why did not the coal operators use it against John L. Lewis? There are only two answers. The law is either unworkable, and unconstitutional, or there was employer appeasement for political purposes. Mr. TAFT says the law does one thing, and Mr. HARTLEY says the law does the opposite.

It will take years of court trials to determine what this hodge-podge of ill-considered legislation will do.

One thing we know: It will not bring industrial peace to America.

RENT CONTROL

Have you had your rent raised lately? Well the Republican leadership wrecked rent controls with the Wolcott bill, and millions of American citizens are faced with rent increases, which are not limited

to 15 percent which they tried to make the people believe.

On hotels, motor courts, and new construction, all rent controls have been removed. The rent gougers are having a holiday. This pleases the landlords' lobby but it does not please the people.

HOUSING

Are you a veteran, and do you need a house to live in?

The Republican leadership wrecked housing control in the Eightieth Congress by choking off appropriations for control and allocation agencies and removing price controls on building supplies.

Prices skyrocketed and essential residential building for the medium-income-bracket civilian and veteran is not available.

This may please the real-estate lobby, but it does not please the returned veteran or the civilian who wants to buy a home at a reasonable price.

FLOOD CONTROL AND RECLAMATION

What about the conservation of our national natural resources?

Do you live in the Missouri Valley, where the floods are costing hundreds of millions of dollars in damage?

The Republican leadership has drastically cut flood control, soil conservation, and western reclamation projects appropriations.

They say this is economy. And the wealthy taxpayers agree; but the people in the flooded Missouri Valley think it is tragic.

And the people of the West, hungry for land, water, and hydroelectric power, are desperate.

Yet the wealthy taxpayers are pleased; but the real wealth, the rich topsoil of America, is swept down the muddy Missouri Valley River to the sea.

They made a few paltry cuts in the taxes, but they cost the people millions by these cuts. The people do not like it.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

In conclusion, the Eightieth Congress should not adjourn on July 26. The Republican leadership should keep Congress in session until they have passed legislation to solve the vital national problems that are affecting the lives of every citizen.

The people need housing. They want inflation stopped.

They want protection against monopoly.

They desperately need flood control.

They need extension of social security into fields of avocation not covered at present.

The aged need a Federal old-age pension. The people need Federal aid for education. The people want world-wide peace. And Congress should busy itself with national problems and stand ready to implement international agreements. The duties and obligations of the Eightieth Congress will not be fulfilled if they adjourn July 26.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ADMINISTRATION OF PALESTINE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago a joint resolution was introduced in both Houses of Congress directing the Secretary of State to request His Britannic Majesty's Government immediately to abolish the emergency regulations at present governing the administration of Palestine and to reestablish a civilian administration and civil liberties to the people of Palestine.

I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to House Resolution 237 and Senate Joint Resolution 149. These resolutions stress the fact that the entire regime in Palestine and the present system of administering the country are illegal and that a de facto state of war exists in that country. It emphasizes the conditions prevailing there, which converted Palestine into a police state the like of which could not be found anywhere in the western world, and the sufferings and hardships imposed on the population under a most brutal totalitarian regime and a rule of ruthless tyranny.

The occasion for that resolution was the confirmation of death sentences pronounced on the three Hebrew patriots, Jacob Weiss, Mayer Nakar, and Absalom Habib, for alleged participation in the liberation of prisoners from the prison of Acre on May 4, 1947, in which no British lives were lost and in which some 250 political prisoners, both Hebrew and Arab, were liberated.

These death sentences passed by a so-called military court, whose legality could not be reasonably established by any stretch of interpretation of international law, have been confirmed by Lt. Gen. G. H. R. MacMillan, commander of the British forces, on July 8, in complete disregard of the plea of the United Nations Special Committee as well as the plea of numerous public bodies inside and out of Palestine. This attitude of the British administration in Palestine, shocking as it is, is even more appalling when one takes into consideration the fact that three death sentences against Nazi generals in Italy, found guilty of the wanton murder of some 350 innocent Italian men, women, and children, have been commuted by another British commanding officer, thus presenting to the world the utterly distorted conception of clemency applied to avowed criminals, on one hand, and cruel and undue punishment applied against sincere idealists and patriots fighting for the liberation of their country and their people, on the other hand. Mr. Speaker, it is only natural that such an attitude on the part of the government of one of our principal allies in the last World War—a government with whom the Government of the United States has maintained over a period of decades the most friendly relations, a government to whom we recently extended very substantial economic help, a government which is continually calling on our people for assistance in the solution of its problems and difficulties—should have provoked in this country, and particularly among the elected representatives of the American people, a wave of shocked indignation and anger. For the American people and its representatives are not prone easily to forget that we have recently concluded a victorious war against fascism and nazism in the defense of the very principles of democracy and freedom menaced by the totalitarian states.

The American people and its elected representatives cannot and will not forget that millions of American boys have taken up arms and waged many battles in which hundreds of thousands of them have given their lives so that all men might be free and no people, big or small, be oppressed any longer. For the American people and its elected representatives are fully aware that freedom is one and indivisible all over the world and that an attack on the freedom of any people on this earth is an attack on our own freedom, which we cherish and defend with all our might. The American people and its elected representatives cannot and will not forget that the totalitarian powers whom we defeated also began their attacks on freedom by attacking the Hebrew people, by choosing this peaceful and unarmed people as a test case in order to ascertain how the civilized world would react to an attack on them. We cannot and will not forget, having succeeded in their drive against the Hebrew people, the Nazis established their technique of attacking other peoples one at a time until the time came when they felt strong enough to attack the whole world, including our United States. We must always keep in mind that whenever an attack against democracy is being planned, the Hebrew people are the first victim but they are never the last. Other peoples follow and finally a conflict engulfing the whole civilized world becomes inevitable. We are determined that this shall not happen again and that is why it is our duty to stop aggression against a peace-loving people who have suffered enough—I should rather say too much—before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago words were spoken in the Senate of the United States with dignity and firmness reminiscent of the days of our Declaration of Independence, when the representatives of our people rose to the heights of historical greatness which established our Nation as a guide to all peoples of this world on the path of great achievements for true democracy and freedom and equal opportunity for all. When these words were spoken in the Congress of the United States, no one dared to think that the British Government's reply to these noble sentiments of the representatives of the American people would be another act of cruelty and inhumane brutality against the remnants of the Hebrew people. It is utterly unfortunate that even the most pessimistic among us have misjudged the depth to which the present government of Britain has sunk in its fall from the days of Dunkerque to this day. It is most discouraging to know that the same British Navy which so gallantly fought against tremendous odds in the last war is being used now to commit acts of piracy on the high seas against unarmed vessels on a mercy mission of repatriating to their homeland those remnants of the Hebrew people

who by some miracle escaped the crematoria and the gas chambers to which the Nazis had committed them.

On July 18, 1947, the steamship *Exodus*, carrying some 4,500 Hebrew repatriates to their homeland, was attacked on the high seas some 17 miles outside of Palestinian territorial waters by a swarm of British destroyers, which rammed her, attacked her passengers with tear bombs and small arms fire, and put a boarding party on her main deck. Three persons aboard were killed and over a hundred sustained serious injury. One of the dead was an American crewman, the ship's first mate, William Bernstein, age 24, of Los Angeles. Bernstein leaves a widow and one child.

The battered mercy ship was towed into the port of Haifa, where the repatriates were transferred to British prison ships, and they are now being taken to a French port whence they will be sent back to concentration camps in which most of them have spent up to 8 years, including 3 years after their so-called liberation.

Mr. Speaker, I hardly need to add any remarks to this story drawn from dispatches by American press agencies. The inhuman cruelty of this action of the British Government speaks for itself. But it would hardly be fitting for us to condemn the British Government unless we are prepared to act ourselves in order to come to the rescue of those unfortunate human beings tossed around on the high seas as if they were the scum of the earth.

Let us not forget for one moment that we have not only a moral obligation toward these people, that we would be guilty of forfeiting our Christian principles by standing idly by while they are being driven to despair and maybe even annihilation. Let us not forget for one moment that these are the very people who were one of our most gallant allies in the recent war. Mr. President, permit me to cite from my personal experience. I had the good fortune to be assigned to fight in the last war on one sector of the European underground. I have seen those people fighting almost with their bare fists against the most highly mechanized armies of Nazi Germany. I have seen them risking their lives every minute of the day.

I have seen them holding in check entire divisions of the mighty Wehrmacht while they were only a handful of meagerly armed but determined fighters who believed in the precepts of our own great Jefferson that resistance to tyranny is obedience to God. They have found the courage and the endurance which it took to resist the Nazi invader in their own faith in the principles of freedom and in their faith in us, their allies. They were sincerely convinced that we meant every word of what we said when we declared we were fighting that war for a new democratic order, for the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter. Those people have every right to expect us to fulfill the promises that we so generously made to them. They have every right to ask of us that we liberate them in fact and not make a mockery of the term liberation by leaving them for three full years after liberation day behind barbed wires in the very same concentration camps in which millions of them were annihilated. We would be guilty of complicity in one of the most hideous crimes against humanity if we let them down in this hour of their need; if we permitted them to be thrown around from one port to another instead of stretching out a helping hand to put an end to their wanderings and untold sufferings.

Mr. Speaker, we have assumed moral and legal responsibility for the fate of these people. We signed in 1924 a treaty with Great Britain taking a full share of responsibility for the fulfillment of the mandate over Palestine and for the establishment of a home for those very same unfortunates who are now being denied it.

At this very moment it cannot be fully ascertained whether these victims of Nazi brutality and callous breaches of solemn promises by the western democracies will be forced back into France. I would not take it upon myself to criticize or to pass any judgment on the action of the French Government in this difficult situation. The French Government may feel that whichever way it acts it will be open to some criticism. If it refuses to admit them some people may say that the French Government is thus prolonging the agony of these unfortunate wanderers. If it does admit them, some may say that the French Government is thus becoming an accomplice to the British Government in driving these sufferers back into the concentration camps in which they have already been kept much too long. For my part, I have too high respect for the noble traditions of the great French Republic to doubt even for one moment that whatever action the French Government may take it will be motivated by its concern for the welfare of the 4,500 human beings and not by considerations of political expediency. I am even more inclined to express this belief because of the most praiseworthy record of the Government of France in its unremitting efforts and continuous endeavors to help the Hebrew repatriates in every possible way, despite innumerable difficulties of a political or other nature which they encountered in this field.

But I definitely refuse to believe even for one moment that the French Government would permit itself to be duped by ill-placed considerations of pseudo humanity. These people have undergone untold hardships with one purpose in mind: To leave Europe, the huge graveyard of their kin, and to start a new life in the Holy Land. To force them back into Europe would be cruel and inhuman. I am confident that the great Republic of France will not commit such a disgraceful act.

It would be a very sad day for me and for every decent American when we would have to compare the attitude and actions of the Government of France with the attitude and actions of our own Government and reluctantly come to the conclusion that the comparison was not in favor of our own American Government. It would be a sad day indeed for every decent American when we would have to come to the conclusion that our Government has made numerous declarations of sympathy and compassion, that it did not spare noble phrases and brilliant formulas but, alas, did not lift a finger in order to undertake real action.

Another representation to the British Government by our President would expose once more our country and its highest elected officer to the unpalatable treatment which he incurred on the occasion of numerous previous representations to the British Government on the Palestine matter, which were either ignored or rebuked in a manner incompatible with the dignity of his high office and the respect due to it. It would be futile to expect any results from such a representation after the unsavory experience which we have had with the British Government to this date.

On May 12, 1947, I was one of the 15 Representatives and Senators, Republican and Democratic, who wrote to the President urging that he implement the repatriation program of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, by lending trucks and ships to the displaced Hebrews and facilitating their return to Palestine before another winter sets in. We received word from the State Department that the consideration of this program must wait for the United Nations Special Committee report and that no action can be taken pending the current investigation. Whether or not this argument has sufficient validity is a matter into which I will not enter now, aware as I am of the limited time of my colleagues. But there is one thing about which one cannot have any doubts and this is that regardless of pending inquiries and determination of long-range policies for Palestine or the formulation of the future status and administration of that country, it is our indisputable duty to act and to come to the rescue of the 4,500 Hebrews in this immediate emergency. We cannot wait any longer while human beings are being kicked around from port to port, some of them being shot, some being drowned, and some perhaps disappearing through suicide. Our President has a duty to act and act now. President Truman must extend the protection of the United States to these people. We must at once recognize their full legal right to repatriate themselves to Palestine, a right which our President has so convincingly expressed on several occasions, and we must without further delay assist them in returning to their homeland—Palestine.

I am certain that any step taken by President Truman to guarantee the safety of these Hebrews under the United States flag in returning to Palestine will meet with the most enthusiastic response both in the United States and among decent people the world over. I know of no course other than this one which would be morally justified and legally right under international law.

The 4,500 have been victims of a criminal assault in which some of them lost their lives, others sustained injury, and the rest fortunately survived. We cannot, without losing all claim to decency, let them be the victims of repeated assaults under the pretext that they have to wait for redress from the United Nations. There is no conception in Anglo-Saxon law or international law which imposes on the survivors of a criminal assault the repetition of that same assault while the court is in session.

There is no law in any part of the world which would permit a criminal to repeat his crime while he is being tried for it. We cannot afford to become accomplices to such a repetition and that is exactly what we would be if we do not take action to save the victim from the hands of the criminal.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CAN WE AFFORD TO FOLLOW HERBERT HOOVER'S ADVICE AGAIN?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in February 1947 Mr. Herbert Hoover was asked by President Truman to go to Germany for the purpose of making a study of her economic problems. It was the second time after the defeat of nazism that Mr. Hoover was asked, as an expert on relief, to give the American people the benefits of his long experience and knowledge.

The American people were entitled to expect from the former President of the United States impartial, fair, and disinterested advice as to what should be done about Germany and her place in the postwar European economy.

I believe the American people will have many reasons to be sadly disappointed with the report Mr. Hoover submitted to them. For the report disregards American interests and security, and is neither impartial nor fair, nor does it attempt to make a decent analysis of the true German economy as it really was in 1936—the year Mr. Hoover wants us to use as a guidepost for the future. Since Mr. Hoover selected 1936, and since in his report he calls all the measures intended to control the German economy fallacies, it behooves us to point out a few of his own fallacies.

It is beginning to be more and more apparent that we never learn anything. We do not learn from history; we do not learn from experience; and it is sad to say that we often cannot learn from our so-called national leaders.

From history we should have learned that there can be no security from German aggression until Germany is made a peaceful nation and without power to wage war. The Versailles Treaty should have taught us that Germany's aggression has an economic foundation. This fact was not recognized after World War I, and all our efforts were concentrated on controlling Germany's military aspirations. In 1919, the Allies imposed some prohibition on the production of military goods; they imposed limitations on the size of the army and navy, but they forgot to impose the only restrictions that count—the restrictions over Germany's industrial production and, in general, over her national economy.

But if we forgot the most essential controls, the Germans did not. Anxious to learn their lesson in order to make good the mistakes that led them to defeat in World War I, they proceeded to study the causes of their debacle. As early as 1923, the Germans had already developed their economic general staff. British Gen. J. H. Morgan of the Allied Disarmament Commission watched them in the middle twenties preparing for World War II. He reported his findings but nobody wanted to study them. From him, as well as from other sources, we learned that the Germans promoted the latest technique, knowledge, and research of synthetic and other methods of production in order to give the new Germany the industrial potential she needed to conquer Europe. Nor did the Germans overlook anything in order to procure the working capital needed for the expansion of their industrial plants. Germany was badly in need of money. This she obtained when the western powers were only too eager to get rid of their postwar savings. Indeed, they almost begged Germany to accept their investments. The reason advanced to the people was that Germany needed the foreign money in order to enable her to pay her reparations.

When Germany claimed that she could not pay reparations unless she was allowed to sell abroad her increased industrial products, Germany's neighbors fell into this trap and thus were economically weakened.

When German industrialists complained of too much competition from her neighbors—that is when Germany began flooding Europe with her increased industrial output—her neighbors complied with Germany's wishes by entering into cartel agreements which enabled Germany to manipulate Europe's foreign trade. The result of these cartel activities was that Germany's war potential was built up. Still, nobody complained about it. Nor did anybody complain when it was found out that Germany used deliberate ruses in order to entice her erstwhile enemies. Germany's foreign cartel partners said nothing about these ruses even when they discovered them. Even now the people hardly realize what these ruses meant. In the case of steel, for instance, in order to induce her erstwhile enemies, France and Belgium, into joining them in forming the international steel cartel, the Germans deliberately asked for a smaller quota of steel than Germany could easily produce. Immediately after the establishment of the cartel, the Germans proceeded to manufacture much more than their quota, paid the stipulated fines, but succeeded thus in becoming the dominating partner of the cartels. Thanks to this deception, the Germans soon succeeded in controlling Europe's entire steel and coal production. By virtue of these agreements, not only did Germany obtain the power over the economic life of Europe, but by exploiting to the limits many cartel devices, she was in a position to obtain direct access to military developments abroad. And thanks to the cartel system also, Germany was able to maintain an intelligence service which the best spy system could not procure for her.

GERMANY'S INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

The industrial development so auspiciously begun under the Republic was perfected under the Nazis. The foreign-trade manipulations for the purpose of giving Germany power to wage war and for the specific aim of weakening her neighbors and prospective victims reached tremendous proportions in the thirties. Her industrial potential reached a new high; she became the most powerful industrial nation in Europe prior to World War II. Some of the basic plants built or enlarged in the twenties, thanks to the farsightedness of the German industrial leaders and the general staff and thanks to the huge loans granted by the democratic nations, were found to be small in the thirties.

As the crescendo of industrial production mounted, the Germans suddenly discovered that the coal mines were not sufficiently mechanized to meet the labor shortages. They began to realize that the demands for coal-tar derivatives had been underestimated; as a result more ovens and distillation plants were built. As the growing importance of her aerial warfare became apparent, the Germans realized that the aluminum production as originally planned was too small. Germany's aluminum production was pushed to the extreme and became second to none.

The development of Germany's industries could not be arrested in the thirties. Each unanticipated expansion of one industry put new burdens on other industries on which it was based. Thus a large aluminum output called for more electric power, and the new electric power in turn called for a greater coal output. This was also the case with magnesium, when that metal was found to be of strategic importance.

Indeed, the thirties were unsurpassed insofar as they pertain to the expansion of Germany's industries. For instance, the development of synthetic oil was deliberately held down in the twenties because of its high costs. In 1935, oil production reached 300,000,000 tons, and by 1939 it was 1,500,000,000 tons.

When we speak about Germany's development of her industrial production, we mean in the first place, Germany's heavy industry, and by heavy industry we mean her war potential, her ships, her transports, her arms, her ammunitions, her tanks, and the metals necessary to expand the industrial capacity to produce and to service them. In order to accomplish the program the original German planners had in mind, it was necessary to build a powerful iron and steel industry. The iron and steel industry is essentially the best yardstick to measure a nation's ability to wage a successful war. This can best be illustrated by

casting a glance at the increase in production of pig iron. Between 1933–38, Germany's pig iron production was increased 350 percent, while ingot steel output tripled during the same time.

An increase of such magnitude requires capital. The best way to illustrate what Germany did in the thirties is to show where her money was spent. Official records available show that between 1933–36 Germany spent most of her income on the development of her capital goods or heavy industry. In 3 years after Hitler seized power, Germany's new investment in heavy industry was increased almost 500 percent while it increased only 200 percent in the consumer goods industry. Thus, in 1933 the amount of new investments in heavy industry was 309,000,000 marks and in 1936 it was 1,593,000,000 marks. In the consumer goods division the increase during the same year was from two hundred and forty-eight to four hundred and ninety-one million marks.

These figures are extremely important and must always be kept in mind in discussing Germany's economy as it was known in the thirties. These figures clearly show that German economy before the war was deliberately planned to give Germany the mastery over Europe—war or no war.

The following economic realities indicate the magnitude of Germany's prewar conquest.

In 1936, with less than 10 percent of the area and 20 percent of the population of Europe, Germany accounted for one-half and in some cases much more than one-half of the total European production of heavy industries that furnished her war potential—coal, pig iron, steel, nitrogen compound, machine tools, and machinery. In other categories such as cement, sulfuric acid, electric energy, cotton and wool yarn, and paper, more than one-third of the European production was concentrated in Germany.

Already in 1936 it was clear that no European power was in a position to withstand Germany's economic pressure. The regular trade practices of Europe were upset by Germany's machinations and dumping. No nation could oppose Germany's ruthless trade practices. In the fields of heavy machinery, machine tool industries, and aluminum, Europe became subservient and dependent upon Germany for supplies. The total result was that Europe's trade and commerce were not in a position to prosper.

WHAT MR. HOOVER SHOULD KNOW

Such, in brief, was the picture of Europe's economics in 1936. Historical data pertaining to Germany's ulterior motives are available. Brig. Gen. J. H. Morgan described Germany's ulterior motives as far back as the twenties in his recent book, Assize of Arms.

All European businessmen and financiers have, at one time or other, had to suffer from Germany's methods of trading. American businessmen who had dealings with Germany and Europe in the middle thirties are only too well acquainted with Germany's practices.

The American chemical industry knows from sad experience how eager the German chemical industry—and especially the infamous I. G. Farben—were to allow the development of the chemical industry in the United States prior to and subsequent to World War I. The European victims of Germany in World War II know full well what Germany's economic domination meant to them between 1939–45.

One would naturally have assumed that Mr. Herbert Hoover, although fate was kind enough to bring him into this world in the United States, thus sparing him the indignity of living under German domination, would have also learned the fundamentals of European economics, even as any fair-minded economist or historian.

Mr. Hoover was spared the horrors of living in a Nazi hell during World War II, but he has visited Europe many times. He has just returned from a special mission to Germany and has written a report to the President in which he states that he has exhaustively examined Germany's heavy industry and plants. On the basis of his analysis, Mr. Hoover claims that Germany should be allowed the full development of her heavy industries, and he chose 1936 to illustrate what Germany could do for Europe.

I do not know what titles Mr. Hoover has to show that he is an expert on German economics. If he is entitled to give all sorts of advices to the American people, the most elementary ethics would require that he tell the American people the most elementary facts about Germany—namely, that the German economy was a war economy. This was not expecting too much, since the people are entitled to know the significance of Mr. Hoover's recommendations in terms of our security and the peace of the world. Mr. Hoover should have shown the American people what Germany's economic domination of Europe in 1936 meant to the world at large in terms of blood, sweat, and tears and also what it would mean in the future if Germany were to be allowed to go back to 1936.

GERMANY'S WAR POTENTIAL

One was entitled to expect Mr. Hoover, who only a few months ago personally inspected the existing German plants—some slightly damaged but mostly intact and ready to dominate and enslave Europe again—to tell the American people that Germany is only militarily defeated, but that her economy is only temporarily at a standstill. After all, he knows and can reveal that the base of German aggression—the base which it built up over the last 25 years and which enabled her to nearly conquer the world—is virtually untouched. To take the case of machine tools, Mr. Hoover, as an outstanding engineer, surely was best qualified to tell the people that before the war Germany, with a population only one-half as large as that of the United States and with an economy not as highly mechanized as that of the United States, had a machine-tool, machinery, and machine-building capacity larger than that of the United States. Since Mr. Hoover studied German industry in 1947, did he not see for himself that Germany, after losing the war, still possesses over 4,000,000 tons of undamaged machine tools? Why did he not tell the American people that the existing German machine-tool industry is decidedly a menace to the peace of the world?

Apparently, Mr. Hoover is not perturbed about the tremendous machine-tool industry. Not only does he not mention its existence, not only does he not make any comparisons between German's available machine tools of 1936 and that of 1947, but he has nothing to say about making use of these machine tools as reparations. On the contrary, he makes the flat recommendation that no installations be removed for reparations. Since Mr. Hoover has certainly heard of the pathetic demands of the Inter-Allied Reparations Agency at Brussels, he apparently is satisfied that the 18 nations clamoring for machine tools are not entitled to any consideration.

Mr. Hoover speaks of 1936 as the year which enabled Germany to supply the world with the necessary products, but he does not tell of the tremendous increase of Germany's steel capacity between 1933–36. We believe the American people are entitled to get a concise analysis from Mr. Hoover dealing not only with the steel industry but with other phases of Germany's future ability to wage war as well. Mr. Hoover, therefore, should have dwelled on the present-day industrial capacity, technological and scientific organization, economic assets owned outside Germany and the nature of German's highly integrated economy which makes Germany today still a potential threat to the safety of the world.

Mr. Hoover is rightly concerned about Germany's ability to make a living. But speaking about Germany's ability to export, Mr. Hoover sees only two alternatives: either Germany exports the products of the light industry or the heavy industry. Mr. Hoover dismisses light industry because the products of the light industry would compete with those of Britain in which case Britain's economic situation would further deteriorate, and this in turn would call for an additional loan from us. Consequently, Mr. Hoover is in favor of Germany's exporting the products of her heavy industry.

AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Mr. Hoover does not attempt to show the economic consequences involved in his recommendations to make Germany's heavy industries work for Europe. Does Mr. Hoover not know that sheet steel, strip steel, rolled steel, railroad equipment, machines, dynamos, can be produced in Belgium, France, Czechoslovakia, Britain, and so forth? If it is true that Germany's light industry can be a menace to Europe, as Mr. Hoover fears, the menace of Germany's heavy industry can be infinitely greater. For it is obvious that the non-German heavy industries will be penalized in order to allow the German heavy industry to work full blast. A stagnant heavy industry in Western Europe will retard the development of Germany's victims. Their entire economy will be affected, unemployment will increase and their

currency will deteriorate still further. In order to stave off hunger and political bankruptcy, these nations will turn for additional loans to the United States, thus nullifying Mr. Hoover's efforts to alleviate the harassed taxpayer.

Mr. Hoover's logic is difficult to follow, indeed. The European nations have suffered because before the war their economy was allowed to be dominated by Germany. They have suffered from the domination of German heavy industry; they bled, fought, and finally were freed from the German nightmare with the promise they will have "freedom from fear." Surely the Allies did not mean that after the war the victims of Germany would be asked to submit their entire economic life to the will of the very same leaders of the German heavy industry. True, Mr. Hoover himself did not promise Europe "freedom from fear," but it is difficult to see how his humanitarianism can allow him to make such an uncharitable recommendation. And what makes this recommendation more ominous in his answer to the all-important problem of control over the German war potential, with the simple statement: "And twoscore of intelligent men could see that there is no arms production and that no industry is manufacturing or storing material for evil purposes."

Mr. Hoover refuses to learn anything from history, from economics, and from the deeds of the German heavy industry. A most casual glance at Germany's economic activities of the thirties could easily convince him that it was not only the arms and ammunitions the Germans stored that paralyzed Germany's victims, but German machine shops, steel capacity, and, above all, German domination of her neighbor's machines, technique, and economy.

HOOVER IGNORES THE COAL PROBLEM

Mr. Hoover was sent to Germany as an expert on economics, yet he does not mention coal as a commodity which Germany has in abundance and which she can produce and export in considerable quantities. Mr. Hoover, after all, as an engineer knows that before the war Germany used to export tremendous quantities of coal and coke to Europe. Since Mr. Hoover chose 1936 as a yardstick, it is only fair to point out that that year over 50 percent of Europe's metallurgical coke orginated in Germany. Therefore, Mr. Hoover surely must know that Germany, in those days, had enough coke to smelt the metal for its own war machine and had enough left over to supply a large proportion of the fuel needed to operate Europe's furnaces. When the German war machine needed more coke, this was provided without difficulty, as can be seen from the tremendous increase in production of metallurgical coke between 1933 and 1938. German statistics show that in 1933 Germany produced 21,200,000 tons of coke, whereas in 1938, her production had more than doubled and amounted to 43,500,000 tons.

Surely Mr. Hoover, in his exhaustive studies of Germany's economics, is aware of the fact that in order to prepare her war machine, Germany used tremendous quantities of coal in her steel, power-generating industries and as a basis for production of heavy chemicals, synthetic oil, plastics, and so forth.

Mr. Hoover also knows that coke-oven byproducts were extensively used in the German coal-tar-dye industry, explosives, plastics, poison gases, and so forth.

Moreover, Mr. Hoover knows that Germany's peacetime economy cannot possibly consume the tremendous prewar coal production. For instance, during World War II, synthetic oil and synthetic rubber based on domestic Geman coal, effectively replaced imports of rubber and oil. In many instances, coal served as a raw material for ersatz products and became of increasing importance in the German industrial self-sufficiency. Obviously, a peaceful Germany would not need to consume her coal for purposes of making these synthetics.

Does Mr. Hoover realize what he is asking the American people to underwrite when he says:

> The Anglo-American zones should abandon the destruction of plants, the transfer of plants for reparations, and the level-of-industry concept and start every plant—the heavy as well as the light.

NAZIS STILL IN CHARGE

Perhaps Mr. Hoover, when he made his exhaustive study of Germany's heavy industries, did not have the time to see how useful the Germans have been to Europe, when they got the power. At any rate, Mr. Hoover knows that the German Bizonal Economic Committee was given authority over economic matters January 1, 1947. In the Ruhr the Germans have had their way for quite a while now. They have been running the plants, controlling and supervising the coal production, and for all practical purposes, have been doing as they pleased. Some of the most important German industrialists with the worst Nazi records have been placed again in charge of their plants and mines. The notorious Nazi, H. Dinkelbach, is again the head of the whole steel industry; the Hitler supporter, Poensgen, is again head of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke; the Zangens Rasch, Abs, Hugenbergs, Vits, and other high Nazi profiteers are again in charge of their businesses. But Europe has not been getting the products of the Ruhr. Mr. Raymond Daniell was in Germany at the time Mr. Hoover was studying very hard. Describing the general bad faith of the Germans as he saw it, he had this to say, March 30, in the New York Times:

> In this atmosphere it is only natural that blackmail, bribery, and chicanery of various sorts have become weapons of patriotic resistance. There is no open sabotage, but thefts of coal on a large scale, black-market dealings in the produce of the Ruhr factories and holding back farm produce—all are on the increase. The Germans are still using coal and factory products of the Ruhr to soften the peace.

Would Mr. Hoover be kind enough to explain how he would supervise the activities of Messrs. Zangen, Dinkelbach, Hugenberg, and so forth, and what methods does he envisage to see to it that the Germans do supply the coal and other raw materials to their former victims and neighbors? The implication of the recommendation Mr. Hoover advocates is that Germany should be granted full use of her coal for the production of her prewar steel and power industries, heavy chemicals, synthetic oil, plastics, and so forth.

One would have expected Mr. Hoover to inform the American people that, in the past, Germany's domination of the European economy was based on Germany's hard coal. By the same token, one would have expected Mr. Hoover to enlighten the people by telling them that over 80 percent of Germany's hard coal production is concentrated in the western area of Germany now under the control of the British and French authorities. The coal production figures for these regions at the end of World War II are as follows:

	Percent
Ruhr	69.2
Aachen	4.2
Saar	7.2

COAL AND THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

Mr. Hoover knows full well that in 1933, Germany produced only about 109,000,000 tons of hard coal. He also knows that in 1938, under the stimulus of Hitler's 4-year war plan, production of hard coal rose to about 185,000,000 tons.

When Mr. Hoover advocates the full exploitation of every heavy and light German plant, he also advocates Germany's use of all the coal produced in Germany. If this policy is implemented, it would mean thwarting the recovery of Europe. Or, translated into American terms, the longer Germany postpones the delivery of coal to Europe, the less able will Europe be to recover and the more money the American taxpayer will have to spend in order to sustain Europe.

Mr. Hoover, as a close student of European politics, also knows that when he speaks of German heavy industry, he means the Ruhr and Rhine. Further, having studied Germany as he said he did, he knows that Germany's war potential is located in the Ruhr and Rhine. This, notwithstanding, in his lengthy report to the President, he does not have one single word to say about the control, either political or economic, of the Ruhr and Rhine and, indeed, he expressly stipulates that "German industry must be operated by Germans themselves if she is to serve all nations equally."

Since Mr. Hoover does not mention it, presumably he does not want to impose any controls over the Ruhr and Rhine. However, as an expert economist, he knows that Germany has dominated the European economy by cartelizing the heavy industry which, in the first place, meant the steel and coal industries of the Ruhr and Rhine.

HOW GERMANY DOMINATED EUROPE

How did the German heavy industry always use its power? Again I take up the year 1936 which Mr. Hoover takes as a yardstick. The greatest service he can render the American people and humanity at large, is to tell what Germany did in those days. When Germany wanted to enslave the economy of a neighbor, she withheld steel and coal from him and this placed Germany in a

position to dominate her neighbor's politics, thinking, economy, and, indeed, her entire life. When Mr. Hoover asks for the complete development of Germany's heavy industries and when he insists that these industries be left exclusively in German hands, he places the entire European economy in jeopardy again, because the net effect of his recommendation is going to be that the German cartels will continue to dominate Europe and to prepare for World War III. For Mr. Hoover's information, the international steel cartel dominated by Germany's heavy industry is still functioning in Luxemburg.

None of the above-mentioned facts were explained by Mr. Hoover in his report of March 24 to President Truman. What is more, when Mr. Hoover deliberately glossed over the paramount importance of Germany's exports of coal to Europe, he withheld the most important fact the people must know, namely, that coal is deliberately being withheld from Europe in order to lead America to believe that the only possible recovery for Europe lies in Germany's development of her own heavy industry.

Mr. Hoover has this to say about Europe's recovery:

> If Germany's heavy industry is allowed to function she has an ability to export and would become an asset to Europe's recovery.

It is rather significant that Mr. Hoover forgot the most important element essential to Europe's recovery—export of coal from Germany.

Had Mr. Hoover shown the slightest deference to the economic realities of Europe, he would have pointed out that although Germany in 1936 succeeded in becoming the most important economic power in Europe, she still found enough coal and coke to supply her neighbors with the following quantities:

	Tons
France	10,078,000
Belgium and Luxemburg	9,929,000
Italy	8,143,000
Netherlands	7,566,000

Czechoslovakia, Sweden, Denmark, Greece, and other countries were also able to obtain their share of coal from Germany.

WHY NOT COAL FOR FOOD?

Germany's average prewar yearly export of hard coal was about 30,000,000 tons of coal. At present, Europe's recovery requires 100,000,000 tons a year. Allowing for the present state of the rolling stock and other difficulties, it is only fair to assume that in the near future Germany could export 50,000,000 tons of hard coal to Europe.

At the prevailing prices, an export of 50,000,000 tons of coal to Europe can provide Germany with $1,000,000,000 revenue which would enable her to import the necessary foodstuffs and would thus materially help the American and British taxpayers.

This, Mr. Hoover did not mention. Nor did he mention the fact that for the past year every effort is being made by the British authorities to retain the maximum coal for the use of the German industries. Or, to quote General Erskine, in November 1946 Deputy Military Governor of the British zone, "The necessity for stimulating moribund German industries through the utilization within western Germany of hard coal mined there, led to the decision."—To stop the export of coal to Germany's victims.

Mr. Hoover does not explain nor even mention General Erskine's unilateral decision to punish the industries of France, Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg. And yet in his capacity as an economist, humanitarian, and statesman, he knows full well that unless France obtains about 20,000,000 tons of coal she cannot rebuild her own industry and that the inevitable consequences will be that she will have to fall back upon new American help. Not only does Mr. Hoover not say anything about these economic consequences, but he does not even mention the Saar. But even assuming that France obtains the coal supply from the Saar, she cannot fully exploit her iron ore deposits in Lorraine. If France cannot use her iron ore from Lorraine and cannot obtain the coal from the Ruhr, she will have to send her ore to the German Ruhr—exactly as was the case in the thirties. This means that although Germany lost the military war for the second time during this century, she won her industrial war.

IF GERMANY WINS

And what will be the consequences of Germany's winning her industrial war? Mr. Hoover's aversion to communism need not be stressed here. Nor for that matter need we stress ours. It is essential, however, to exploit further the political consequences of Mr. Hoover's recommendations to rebuild Germany's heavy industry.

The Communist parties in France and Italy, forgetting for a moment those of the smaller western nations, are very powerful and have shown a remarkable ability to exploit the faulty thinking of some western European and American statesmen. They have succeeded so far in becoming powerful because they know how to exploit the trials and tribulations of the peoples of their respective countries. The longer plants are idle because of the lack of supplies from Germany, the greater the misery and want, and the more Frenchmen and Italians can be converted to communism.

It is clear, therefore, that Mr. Hoover does not seem to be worried about the plight of the industries in western Europe, nor about the workers who may be pushed farther left, which Mr. Hoover certainly cannot be said to desire. Since coal will have to be found somehow, it could come from Upper Silesia. The question is, How much? One of the important economic factors leading to the scuttling of the Versailles Treaty was the competition between Upper Silesia and British coal. The British antiquated coal industry, after World War I, found it very difficult to compete with the coal coming from the more modernized Upper Silesian coal mines. In those days, the Poles were able to sell their coal at lower rates to France and Italy, despite the long sea journey and the long haul from Katowice to Gdynia. That is one of the reasons why, during the period between the two wars, neither the Polish Government nor its coal were popular with the British politicians.

Things have changed greatly since those times. Today, and until the British economic crisis is over, Britain would presumably not mind seeing Polish coal in western Europe. It would take Poland some time before she is able to husband her rolling stock and overcome the transportation difficulties generally prevailing in Europe. It will also take her time to increase her coal output to meet some of the heavier demands. Then, too, the deliveries will most certainly be subject to the prevailing political conditions. The political times being what they are, coal has become one of the most important "political" raw materials of the postwar world. This being the case, both the east and the west can play the same game. So long as the Hoover philosophy prevails and coal is withheld from western Europe in order to rebuild Germany again, Poland and eastern Europe can afford to wait and bide their time. This new economic and political power play can easily be based upon coal—Polish coal—even as the Anglo-American economic play is based upon the oil in the Middle East.

Western Europe lost heavily when the Germans were allowed to dominate the European economy in the thirties. It is bankrupt now because of it. And we also know that one does not cure a poisoned patient by giving him the same dose of arsenic. Nor does one cure the patient by giving him a substitute, but equally man-killing, arsenic.

Common sense suggests that so long as the policies of Mr. Hoover and those of like mind in the United States and Britain continue to be implemented, the industrial future and the democratic institutions of the nations which have been on our side in the recently concluded struggle are in jeopardy.

If communism has been able to recruit so many new supporters in western Europe, it was not only due to the fact that unemployed workers cannot be satisfied with Mr. Hoover's rugged individualism, but also because they cannot understand why they should be freezing and starving, so that the empires of Stinnes, Krupp, and Thyssen may be rebuilt.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I wish to present a very timely article written by Dr. Jean Pajus that appeared in the magazine To Prevent World War III. Dr. Jean Pajus is a former adviser to FEA in Washington, and to the Division of Cartels and External Assets in Berlin.

GERMANY—TWO YEARS LATER

(By Jean Pajus)

Germany surrendered on May 8, 1945. She capitulated because she was utterly bankrupt—militarily, physically and morally. No nation in modern times has succumbed in greater universal condemnation than Germany and no end of hostilities engendered so much hope in the hearts of men.

To many people, Germany was no longer a problem. Although they were more concerned with the dramatic sweep of events

than with the realities of life, these observers were ready to agree that certain measures were necessary to assure the final and definitive peace for the world. In general, most people were in favor of some measures against a possible revival of a bellicose Germany.

Two years ago, after 5 years of war, the peoples of the world were aware that peace must be built upon a firm foundation, that security from German aggression cannot be maintained without education, good will, and with the proper economic and industrial safeguards. They have had ample opportunities to see how Germany prepared her war by marshaling her economic power and how she succeeded in controlling occupied Europe not with bayonets alone, but with economic controls. One may also add that these thoughts were not the product of hatred or revenge, nor was it the product of the school of hard or soft peace; the people's desires were for a peace rooted in common sense.

WHAT WE EXPECTED

Specifically, the peoples wanted to see a new Germany, a Germany free of the traditional German authoritarian, militaristic, and ultra-nationalistic ideals which, in the past, have proved the bane of existence for Europe and the world. The world was tired of fighting and tired of the perennial Germany which knew only how to incarnate the pernicious spirit of evil. The peoples of the world may not have a great sense of history, but they knew what Germany had done to them.

The peoples of the world sincerely believed that the Allies, having suffered horribly for 5 years, had finally learned their lesson. The world was entitled to expect the victors to teach the vanquished how to live by showing them their own sincerity and good faith and, above all, introduce into Germany democratic economic and political principles needed to make a new start.

The Allies were entitled to demand reconstruction of the devastated territories, and they expected that the German economy would be placed at the service of Europe. They were also entitled to obtain reparations, restitution of stolen goods, and reconstruction of their devastated plants.

The peoples of the world wanted and were entitled to be given permanent safeguards against German renewed aggression. This meant not only nominal disarmament of the German military forces or destruction of a few military installations, but permanent Allied control of Germany's industrial war potential.

The peoples of the world wanted and were entitled to obtain guarantees that the German economy, equipped as it has always been to wage war, would henceforth contribute her share to the peaceful development of Europe; that she would never again be permitted to disturb the regular commercial practices by resorting to the use of dishonest devices in the field of commerce and industry, as in the past.

The peoples of the world were given assurances during the war that their wishes would be met. Solemn pacts were entered into. There was Yalta, there was Potsdam, and there were innumerable pledges by all the allied statesmen at Moscow, at London, and at Paris.

No time in history has witnessed a greater failure and bankruptcy of pledges and hopes than the past 2 years. The failure is the more tragic, because the peoples of the world have never been told the extent of the violations of the pledges; thus they are not in a position to assess the damage done to their future security. What is more, the people still do not realize that they have been told deliberate falsehoods usually cloaked under cover of mutual recriminations thrown by the erstwhile Allies against each other.

Two years after our victory, the world is witnessing the most unusual spectacle: Defeated Germany is enjoying the enviable position of being able to choose between two blocs. Germany, who cannot even be asked anything officially, is in a position to make her weight felt. Despite her plight, she is coveted and courted as no other nation. Germany knows it and she can again impose her conditions.

The new Germany has not materialized. The masses of the German people are today, less than ever, amenable to accept the principles of a democratic society. The German people at large, feel no responsibility for their crimes, nor do they feel responsible for the destruction of Germany itself.

Justice Jackson put his finger on the spot when he said in April 1947, "No people has a stronger will to survive and dominate than have the Germans. And Hitler's dual policy of multiplying the Germans and biologically weakening or exterminating their rivals will reach its consummation in a generation." This was the conclusion Justice Jackson reached after listening to the evidence presented at the trial of the war criminals at Nuremberg.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay has not seen any change of heart on the part of the German people. "The military government," he said, "cannot in full conscience restore the self-responsibility of government to the German people, who have not shown that they are willing to denazify their public life."

Meanwhile, we are losing ground day by day. The prewar traditional autocratic forces we had hoped to eliminate are inching back into positions of power and profit. So long as these traditional German forces are not eliminated, it is impossible to speak of a spiritual regeneration of the German people.

The forces that led the world to disaster are again in charge of business and political administration. The real democratic elements of the German people are rather small and they were never given a chance. They are dismayed because they were not invited to make their contribution to the rebuilding of the new Germany and they stand aghast when they see the results of the so-called democratization of Germany's public life. Having watched the activities of the Nazis in power, they are appalled when they discover that the German denazification courts were only able to find that Baden had 2 percent, Hessen 9 percent, and Bavaria 8 percent of unworthy officials.

These democratic elements in Germany were told by Justice Jackson last year, that there were 2,000,000 active criminals in German organizations. Moreover, they knew that in 1933 there were 17,000,000 Nazi votes.

GERMANY'S MIND TODAY

Germany cannot make her spiritual revolution so long as the traditional enemies of democracy are allowed to continue their work. These enemies of Germany's spiritual revolution were cleared by the German denazification courts because they were able to convince the judges that at one time they were regular church-goers, or showed courage during air raids, or were able to show that they have lost members of their families during air raids, or that they have lost property during the war, or have extended protection to persecuted minorities.

Nobody in his right mind will want to question charity nor deny fair play to the Germans, but the results obtained by the Germans in their efforts to undergo a spiritual change, clearly show that the Germans themselves have not made an attempt to recast their thinking and attitude toward those who led the world to disaster.

Yet one hesitates to condemn too severely the Germans for their failures of the past 2 years. The outside world always knew that the Germans never had the proper leadership nor training in democracy. That is why the world expected the Allies to show them how democracy works. The Allies have failed. The sort of lessons we have shown the Germans in democracy the past 2 years can be gathered from our experiences in Bavaria. When it was pointed out to our political adviser, Dr. Walter Dorn, that in Bavaria 62 to 80 percent of the verdicts of the German spruchkammer, or denazification courts, were erroneous and that this was openly admitted by the Bavarian President Minister himself, Dr. Dorn replied: "Be careful. He is an old-line reactionary and a strong nationalist. If you offend him, he might resign."

The question is how can we expect the Germans to learn democracy if we appoint reactionary and nationalist politicians, and if we refuse to teach them what we mean by democracy?

Can we blame the Germans for their shortcomings, when the spectacle they see is not very edifying—to say the least. The Germans see tremendous power enjoyed and exercised by German magnates, industrialists, bankers, and spoliators of occupied territories, high officials who have contributed their share to the seizure of power by Hitler, and by others who helped to bring about World War II. The Germans find key positions, held by administrators in towns, districts, laender and on the bi-zonal level—men who now claim to be servants of liberty, but who, in reality, owe their positions to the prominent roles they played under Hitler. The same phenomenon can be observed in all four zones. In the Russian zone, leading Nazis suddenly become members of the Socialist Unity Party and collaborate with the Communists. In the western zone the Germans see millions of Nazis suddenly denazified without trial or benefit of hearing, as was the case last Christmas.

OUR ADMINISTRATION

Two years after Germany's defeat, we are forced to admit that the real tragedy of our occupation of Germany lies in the psychological attitude of the military government or rather in the lack of the proper psychological attitude toward Germany. We have shown so far misunderstanding, ignorance and lack of good faith, which in the long run is bound to cost us the victory. We have placed our dearly won victory in unsteady hands, we have selected officials without qualifications, some intellectually dishonest or incapable, others who are indifferent, still others who are realists, and what is more tragic, we have appointed officials who for years had strong economic and other ties with the real rulers of Germany.

What the allied administrators are doing in Germany is carefully noted by the average German. Their association with the former German leaders does not escape him and the common man cannot help but wonder—weren't the former leaders indicted along with the 22 war criminals at Nuremberg? Seeing his former leaders in the company of high Allied officials, the average German is led to believe that Nuremberg could not have meant what it said.

The average German, after listening for months to the testimony of Schacht and Von Papen, could no longer claim that he was not informed of the crimes committed by his erstwhile economic and financial masters. He was convinced that Schacht and Von Papen could never escape. What did he think when he heard the verdict from the highest Allied tribunal that Schacht and Von Papen were not guilty? Accustomed as he was to cynicism in Nazi high places, he could not help but reason that the Allies can show cynicism of their own. He naturally arrived at the conclusion that these two leaders of the Nazi regime had friends in high

places among the Allies who did not want to convict the real criminals of Germany—the bankers and industrialists. The same German could not help but think that the real masters of prewar Germany were right, because deep down in his own heart he knew that at Nuremberg only the accomplices of Germany's crimes were convicted and that the real culprits were deliberately allowed to escape into the international never-never of intrigue and politics. Moreover, the average German learned that the real spirit of prewar Germany was left intact because at Nuremberg only the crude and indecent side of Germany's nature—the Nazi side—was punished by the highest Allied tribunal.

ORGY OF NATIONALISM

The repercussions of the Allied failures have made themselves fully felt in many manifestations of a new truculent nationalism. This nationalism encompasses the whole political life of Germany. Everyone is a nationalist now. Even the Communists are enraged nationalists and they are fighting for the prewar integrity of the German territory; they are violently opposed to any cession of territory to Germany's neighbors. They are fighting against France's demands for the coal resources of the Saar. The Socialists, under the leadership of Kurt Schumacher, who was properly coached and trained in Britain, speak the nationalist language used by the Socialists after World War I; in their chauvinistic anti-Polish outbursts they are more virulent than the worst Junkers in their "Drang nach Osten" days. The Christian Socialists, carefully nurtured by American politicians, have inherited the mantle of Von Papen and Breuning and speak for the center party. The Liberal Democrats—a strange name for such a party—have organized a strong movement which provides the real hide-out for all the Nazis and reactionaries. Their solicitude for the German refugees knows no bounds and their defense of the prewar German territories provides them with the real drug the German masses are willing to absorb.

This nationalistic orgy is a direct result of the policies pursued by the Allies and by their representatives in Germany. The average German is now convinced that his own prewar forces were right after all, since the occupying authorities themselves are practicing fraternization extensively and are continually pushing the autocratic and conservative forces to the forefront—politically and economically. The tragedy becomes appalling and hopeless when the British go so far as to order the German authorities to reinstate to former prominent positions outstanding leaders in industry found guilty of high crimes against humanity.

One wonders how the British will try from now on to educate the new Germany when they ordered the reinstatement of Dr. Wolf Witzleben, Johann Benkert, Bruno Pohlmann, all very high officials of the notorious Siemens Electrical Co., of Germany—the biggest trust in the field which for years has been dominating the electrical industry in Europe.

The Siemens Co. and the above-mentioned officials have been proven guilty of the following crimes: slave labor, atrocities against foreign workers in concentration camps, soliciting and obtaining the exclusive monopoly of operating the electrical equipment and instruments at Auschwitz and Buchenwald.

It was thanks to the tremendous power wielded by the Siemens Co. in Nazi Germany, and the excellent technical ability of their directors, that the best methods of exterminating 10,000 human beings every 24 hours were installed in the concentration camps. The German courts went through the evidence submitted and carefully sifted the affidavits supporting the evidence. The German people were duly told about the Witzleben, Benkert, Pohlmann roles in these atrocities and they were also told that there was no place in the new Germany for these officials. The verdict of the German courts was reversed by the British authorities and the German people were told that these three officials must be returned to power in the new Germany. This was the answer given the German workers who struck in protest against this iniquitous Allied verdict—the symbol of the new Germany.

THE NEW ANGLO-GERMAN FRIENDSHIP

Symbolic also, for both, the Allied world and the new Germany, was the report emanating from Germany at the same time that the General Electric Ltd. of London was negotiating for the purchase of a sizable block of shares of the Siemens Co., at the very same time the United States authorities were insisting on decartelizing the giant electrical trust. The meaning of these events is bound to make the proper impression on the average German; henceforth, he will know that there is a community of interest between big corporations of Germany and Britain, and that atrocities can be quickly forgotten and forgiven provided a satisfactory financial arrangement can be made between British and German interests.

While it is difficult enough to explain the doings of the military government to the Germans, it is well-nigh impossible to gage the consternation of the allied world which expected a new concept of justice to be applied to Germany.

During the final phase of the war, the democratic forces in Britain were given to understand by the Churchill Government that their sufferings were not in vain. The British people were told that justice would be meted out to the German criminals. A few months later, after the Germans surrendered, the labor government was swept into power and this time the British people breathed easier for they were sure that the people's government, not having any economic or financial tie-ups with the prewar German forces, would certainly see to it that the forces of evil would be eliminated from Germany. As good Britons they expected British justice to be set up as a model for the Germans themselves. The peoples of the world may not know too much about the relations between General Electric Ltd., and Siemens and its gas-chamber experts, but they do know that the tremendous war potential accumulated by the great German combines, must be destroyed. They have heard enough of the Goering, Werke, Bosch, I. G. Farben and others to know that peace will never be secure unless the war equipment built up by the German heavy industry is destroyed. Two years after Germany surrendered, the people are being told that in the British zone the most heavily industrialized of all—only 7 percent of the tank, aircraft, artillery, and other factories termed dangerous by the allied experts, have been dismantled. This is not what the people of Britain had hoped for. Nor did they expect that after 2 years of waiting, 18 nations, victims of German aggression, would receive only 6 factories from the western zone as reparations out of 1,557 plants earmarked for removal.

Nor, for that matter, will the people of Britain understand—if they are ever told about it—why Britain is keeping intact steel plants in Germany with a staggering total capacity of over 18,000,000 tons, whereas Britain's total capacity is in the neighborhood of 15,000,000 tons per year, and Germany's pre-Hitler domestic needs amounts only to 4,000,000 tons.

DEMONOPOLIZING GERMANY?

For almost 2 years now the British Labor Government has been telling the world that the British people did not like the German monopolists any more than the rest of the world. Yet, in occupied Germany, each time the British authorities were asked by the American authorities when they would finally agree to implement article XII of the Potsdam Agreement calling for the elimination of excessive economic power from Germany, the reply invariably was that Britain is all in favor of a socialized economy and against private monopolies. As proof of their intentions, the British officials would invariably advance the record of nationalization of vital segments of their own economy in Britain. Moreover, the British authorities would extol the greatness of their plans to place the natural resources of Germany at the service of the people rather than leave them to the industrial magnates who led Germany to disaster. For 2 years, the British have been calling their plan socialization rather than nationalization. The purpose, they claimed, was to eliminate the power of the German industrialists. These good intentions have never been kept. Nor were any of the broad concepts dealing with the economic controls of Germany ever kept in the British zone. The answer is not difficult to find: Britain never really wanted to socialize the German industry. This attitude is common to both the conservatives and labor parties, because neither is anxious to forego the dividends from British investments in the Ruhr. This is also the major reason for the British hostility to the idea of internationalizing the Ruhr and other economic safeguards against renewed German aggression.

Instead of decentralizing the economy of the Ruhr, the British have tended more and more to concentrate the economic power there. Nowhere else is the British attitude better shown than in the flat refusal to do away with the past abuses perpetrated by the German industries and their activities in international cartels. The formula calling for the elimination of the abuses was simplicity itself and had the added attraction of not requiring an elaborate international machinery to enforce it. The formula merely stated that Germany must not be allowed to become a party to international cartel agreements. This, the British Government has flatly refused to accept. This refusal alone indicates the faith one can attach to the British policy of socialization of the German industry. Another characteristic of the British intention is their refusal to prohibit monopolistic practices in Germany.

After 2 years of Allied efforts to eliminate the greatest source of economic abuse known, the British have finally accepted the principle of decartelization, and have submitted a tentative list of cartels to be eventually decentralized. But the acceptance of the principle was accompanied with a whole string of stipulations, one of them being that the whole slate be subject to final approval by the zone commander. They further stipulated that the commander of the British zone must have final authority in determining the suitability of each particular German company and the method to be used in decartelizing the company. In other words, the problem of decentralizing the German industry will be left to the discretion of the British commander. Parenthetically, how bright the chances of decartelizing the German industry in the British zone are, can be gaged from the fact that the present commander, Gen. Sir Brian Robertson, has consistently opposed a law that would effectively break up German cartels in the British zone in accordance with the Potsdam Agreement. Other high officials are either connected with British cartels or are in sympathy with their aims.

VEREINIGTE STAHLWERKE EXCEPTED

The list submitted by the British to the American zone is the following:

Krupp, Goering, Flick, Haniel, Mannesmann, Klockner, Wolf, Ballestrem, Dagussa, Siemens & Halske, Ver. Industrie Unternehmungen, Ver. Elektriche Begwerks A. G., Eisleben, Chr. Dierig, Phrix, Feldmuhle Papier, Aschaffenburg, Carl Zeiss, Deutche Continental Gas Ges., Gunther Quandt.

For a start, the list is not too bad, but the irony of the situation is that the biggest steel combine in Europe and the second largest in the world, the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, is not even mentioned as a possible candidate for decentralization.

Is the omission of this steel combine purely accidental? One is inclined to believe that there must be a reason for this omission, since on September 4, 1946, the authorities of the British zone were asked to explain why Alfred Hugenberg, a former member of the Hitler cabinet, chairman of the board of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, one of the most important industrialists and war profiteers who had contributed tremendously to the Nazi Party fund at the time when Hitler was desperate for money, one of the men who contributed tremendously to Hitler's coming to power, was not removed from the managing board of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke. The official British reply was "it takes a vote of the shareholders in the company to remove him as board chairman."

In plain language, the British refusal to remove one of the most important Nazis from the biggest steel combines means that:

(a) While the German state is dead, the Vereinigte Stahlwerke is still vested with sovereign power and can do no wrong, nor can it be punished for past crimes.

(b) The power of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke supersedes that of the Allied military government, which is specifically empowered to remove any German obstructing its administration.

(c) The denazification laws do not apply to the Vereinigte Stahlwerke.

Something must have happened during the month of December 1946 which would seem to indicate the greater weight which Hugenberg carries in the new Germany. That month, German trade-unions from the four zones met for the first time at Hanover, and overwhelmingly called upon the military government to apply the denazification laws in all Germany, especially in her heavy industry, and for elimination of the German monopolies. Instead of seriously considering these just demands, the United States authorities, for their part, saw fit to encourage the revival of the German National Industrial Aid Society—a trade-union movement which was heavily financed and sponsored by Alfred Hugenberg during the Republic. The new German trade unions are wondering why the legitimate demands of the trade-unions have not met with any success.

They have learned that ever since the times of Bismarck, and even before, the leaders of the German industry have followed the practice of associating themselves with powerful industrial organizations. These industrial associations have exerted tremendous influences on German economic and political policies regardless of the composition of the government in power. These industrial associations were behind the expansionist drives of the Kaiser as they were behind the Republic which has never made any attempt to interfere with the power of the heavy industries. Indeed, the economic history of the Weimar Republic is one of gigantic expansion of the biggest German trusts and monopolies. A casual glance at the origin of Vereinigte Stahlwerke and the I. G. Farben will be more than enlightening—it will provide a tragic drama.

The Nazis allowed the industrial associations to prosper because they were heavily indebted to them for their financial support. To compensate these industrialists, the Nazis made membership in their associations compulsory, changed their former names and introduced the principle of leadership into the operation of their associations. In most instances, however, the same men who had been elected representatives of industry prior to 1933 became the appointed leaders after Hitler's coming to power. Until '41, the top organizations in the most vital industry—coal—was the Wirtschaft Gruppe Bergbau. In the steel industry the top organizations had an official status, but the Reich Minister of Economics and other government agencies made use of them and their elaborate provincial organizations in putting into effect many of the economic controls required by the rearmament program and later by the war. In turn, these industrial organizations exerted great influence on the policy-making officials of the Nazi Government as to the nature of these controls and as to every step taken which affected their respective industries. In most instances, the leaders of the industry were high members of the Nazi party and especially appointed to implement the Nazi policies.

In 1941 a central top cartel was founded for every industry in Germany, largely through the efforts of Friedrich Flick, now being tried at Nuremberg. The first top cartel was in the coal industry. This top cartel acquired the absolute mastery of all other coal syndicates and many functions formerly exercised by the German Ministry of Economics were transferred to the top coal cartel. Although Flick and four of his closest associates are in custody, his other associates are still in charge of the coal cartel which is responsible for production of coal for the rehabilitation of Europe.

Flick, to be sure, is a very important criminal, and fortunately for us and unfortunately for him, he was caught, after Germany surrendered, in the United States zone. No such fate, however, befell his friends who happened to be at the moment in the British zone. Collectively, the industrial associations of which Flick was a member, did more harm to the world than Flick did. Yet most of the leaders of these associations and all the companies they controlled have so far escaped the Allied laws affecting the new Germany.

THE SMALLER CIRCLE AT WORK

Way back in 1940, even before the collapse of France, a group of these industrial associations, called the "Smaller Circle" or "Siebener Club" (Club of Seven Members)—used to meet regularly for the purpose of elaborating the expansionist plans for the Nazi government. The plans elaborated by this group later became the law in occupied Europe. The members of the Smaller Circle use to meet before the war too, but in those days they used to shape policies affecting the German secret rearmament plans, procurement of raw materials, war mobilization, etc., which were ultimately executed by public and semipublic agencies such as the coal cartel, the iron cartel, etc. This secret group of seven industrial associations consisted of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, Flick, Krupp, Mannesmann, Hoesch, Klockner, Gutchoffnungshutte. What has happened to the seven? After 2 years of the most heartbreaking labor and cajoling and begging, the British have finally consented to place five of them on the prospective list of cartels to be decentralized on the terms as mentioned above. It is worthy of note that neither the Vereinigte Stahlwerke nor Hoesch steel concerns are mentioned. The individuals representing these concerns so far have fared very well. Wilhelm Zangen, chief manager and brains of the Mannesmann trust is safely protected in the British zone and was mentioned as one of the chief advisers in the reconstruction plans for the German heavy industry. Its chief deputy, Harold Rasch, was pushed by him to become the brains behind the Bi-Zonal Committee. It is only recently that he was succeeded by a so-called socialist, Victor Agartz. It is also worthy of note that both Zangen and Rasch have distinguished themselves as looters of occupied Europe. (See Prevent World War III, issue No. 19, p. 9, the Mannesmann combine.).

ERNST POENSGEN'S ROLE

Alfred Hugenberg of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke has already been discussed. There is one member of the Smaller Circle who deserves our special attention. He is Ernst Poensgen, almost totally unknown in the United States but in reality the most important man in the German heavy industry. His sphere of activity was entirely, unlike that of his colleague Hugenberg, in the international economic field. He was the brains behind the International Steel Cartel of Luxemburg which he organized in 1926, and which gave Germany the power of life and death over Europe's coal and steel. In 1932, immediately after Hitler's coming to power, Poensgen, together with Fritz Thyssen, pledged the entire German heavy industry in support of the Nazi regime. He was the brains behind the German top steel cartel and worked very closely with Flick, plotting the course of looting to be followed after France's defeat. In July 1940, after France's downfall, Poensgen called a meeting of the Smaller Circle and informed them that he personally was entrusted by General of the SS, Otto Steinbrink—at that time gauleiter for the iron and steel industries in France—to draw up a plan of distribution of iron and steel plants in France and Luxemburg, among the members of the Smaller Circle.

The records reveal that Flick was a little jealous of Poensgen's power and wanted to make sure that he, Flick, would get his proper share of the loot. Poensgen duly reassured Flick by telling him that "I will not pass on any project before discussing it with you."

Poensgen, it seems, had some redeeming features, because at one time he did propose that the original French owners be left with 25 percent of the shares of the companies to be looted. Flick, however, was decidedly opposed to the idea and tried to convince the Smaller Circle that the French owners deserved nothing. Perhaps this redeeming feature of Poensgen's would account for the following: Flick is now being tried in Nuremberg while Ernst Poensgen was especially recalled in 1946 from his retirement in Kietzbuhl, Austria, in order to rebuild the power of the German industry because of his excellent contacts with the British cartels. He has been placed again as chairman of the Association of Iron and Steel Trade Manufacturers in the British zone. It is worthy of note that during the war after Flick had established his model top coal cartel, Poensgen was entrusted by the Nazi Party with the mission of establishing the top steel cartel—the Iron Producing Industry, May 29, 1942. Since Poensgen is again the head of the new German steel association, only one small change occurred since 1942 and a very minute one at that—in the title of the new German industrial association. And in order to make absolutely certain that there was no mistake, Poensgen was placed in charge of running again the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, at the end of 1946.

DINKELBACH—THE BRITISH TRUSTEE

Another person who deserves attention is Heinrich Dinkelbach, also of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke. Dinkelbach is a prominent Nazi and has been the financial genius of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke for years. He was Hitler's organizer of the German heavy industry for war. After the downfall of the Nazi regime, Dinkelbach not only escaped denazification, but succeeded in freeing from prison all but 4 of the 31 arrested top Nazi officials of the VS. Parenthetically, there were over 500 top Vereinigte Stahlwerke officials members of the Nazi Party, SS, SA and other Nazi organizations. Dinkelbach was placed, a few months ago, as the head of the iron and steel industry in the British zone and given the former Stahlhaus at Dusseldorf as the new headquarters for the German steel industry. In keeping with the latest modern trends, the Stahlhaus was baptized North Cumberland House—which decidedly symbolizes the real meaning of the British socialization plans. Dinkelbach has been holding meetings with his friends of the steel industry and is now actively engaged setting up the new North German iron and steel control. Also in keeping with the latest trends, Dinkelbach was given to understand by the British that the German stockholders of the steel and iron companies will not lose anything in the reorganization and that he, Dinkelbach, is slated to act as their trustee. These glad tidings were reported at the meeting of the members of the German iron and steel industry, January 17, 1947, by Dinkelbach himself.

Could this be the reason for Britain's inability to remove Hugenberg as the chairman of Vereinigte Stahlwerke?

We must conclude that not much has changed in Germany, except that the British monopolies have succeeded in acquiring through proxies shares of the Ruhr companies. As a result, the prices of Ruhr industrial shares have risen sharply. As a result also, Britain has become the coal dictator of Europe because she controls three-fourths of the coal consumed by Europe before the war.

It took the democratic world 2 years to learn why, way back at the height of World War II, Britain insisted that she alone can understand the Germans and why Britain wanted to carry on its understanding of the Germans by getting the control over Germany's Ruhr.

To be sure, the present Prime Minister of Britain, Clement Attlee, was not in power then, but a few months ago, he was kind enough to provide us with the proper interpretation of the real meaning of Britain's control of the Ruhr. In a speech delivered November 9, 1946, at the Lord Mayor of London's annual dinner, the Labor Prime Minister had this to say regarding the two facets of Germany's problem: "We cannot have a cesspool of cheap, underfed and exploited labor in the middle of Europe, which may bring down our whole standard of life unless we act with great care. Secondly, in doing this, we must preserve our security and that of our Allies. The German industries must never again be allowed to become an arsenal to be used by a new Germany to attack her neighbors or to promote another war, and it is the fine balance that has to be so carefully worked out and the right controls established."

The real meaning of Britain's carefully elaborated plans and new controls over Germany have been unfolding for the past 2 years. We regret to see these plans of the British Government bear the label of the great Labor Party. We would have understood these plans if they had been presented to us as coming directly from the group of bankers and investors who defeated the peace 25 years ago and who placed so much faith in the revival of the German industry as to invest heavily in Germany.

Apparently, not much has changed since then. The same group of pro-German bankers and investors are still making the British policy toward Germany, although the Labor Party has been in power for 2 years. This group of investors still believes that the best people in Germany are the industrialists and bankers; hence, they prefer dealing directly with them. Hence too, they are opposed to placing the resources of the Ruhr—the real German war arsenal—in the hands of an international authority. And since the United States policy doesn't seem to favor the internationalization of the Ruhr either, it is only fair to conclude that we are gambling again with peace and security.

RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE REAL-ESTATE LOBBY

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call the attention of the Members to the fact that I have today introduced a resolution that would set up a committee to investigate the most vicious, most brazen lobby which has ever operated in Washington, namely, the real-estate lobby.

I would like to know, as a Member of this House, just what part they played in wrecking the rent-control bill. I would like to know what part they played in helping to block the over-all, comprehensive housing program that we should have passed.

A resolution was passed the other day to investigate housing. That is the biggest laugh of the year.

What we need is not to investigate whether or not people need housing—the people know that, Mr. Speaker—but to investigate why we have not made it possible for them to obtain housing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include an editorial on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

(The editorial referred to follows:)

[From the Washington Daily News of Monday, July 21, 1947]

REAL ESTATE LOBBY SCORES GRAND SLAM

(By Ned Brooks)

The real estate lobby's series of successes in Congress has soothed the sting of President Truman's rebuke to it.

A check-up showed today that the "interests" recently denounced by Mr. Truman have scored a grand slam with the Republican-led legislators. They have won all major objectives in the current session.

Top victories of the lobby include passage of the voluntary 15-percent increase, the scrapping of most remaining controls on home building and other construction, the pigeonholing of all measures for public housing and rejection of administration plans for a central housing agency.

In reluctantly signing the rent control bill, Mr. Truman suggested an investigation of the real estate lobby, asserting it was "intolerable" that the interests were blocking action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill. He added that "nothing could be more subversive of representative government" than the lobby's "ruthless disregard of the public welfare."

"ON THE CAPITOL STEPS"

Six weeks before the session began, Boyd Bernard, then president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, told members to "wait for the new Congress on the Capitol steps with a proposal for a cushioned decontrol of rents."

On May 12, after the House had passed the bill opening the way for rent increases and repealing most of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, the association notified members:

"We won the first round of rents through the passage of the Wolcott bill. This embodies substantially the program we wanted."

At the same time the association was soliciting its membership for $5 contributions to conduct "legislative and research work" here in Washington. Officials ridiculed statements that it had a $10,000,000 fund available for putting over its program, saying its goal of voluntary subscription was only $59,000.

The Wolcott bill as finally approved carried the 15-percent rent boost for voluntary leases running through 1948, repealed Federal protections against evictions, and freed all new housing from rent ceilings.

It lifted all restraints on nonhousing construction except for amusement and recreational projects and repealed provisions of the Veterans' Housing Act on price limitation, premium payments on scarce materials, channeling of raw materials, and restrictions against "luxury" homes.

All these actions had been urged by the National Association Home Builders at its Chicago convention last February, when Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, author of the combined rent-housing bill, was the principal speaker. Representative WOLCOTT announced at that time he would sponsor the measure.

The law retains veterans' preferences on new homes and keeps the liberalized system of Federal Housing Administration insurance, both of which were favored by the lobby.

Allied with the Home Builders Association and Real Estate Boards in the other campaign for decontrol and other legislation have been the Building Products Institute, National Foundation of Home and Property Owners, Mortgage Bankers Association of America, United States Chamber of Commerce, United States Savings and Loan League, National Apartment Owners Association, Retail Lumber Dealers Association.

MINOR SET-BACK

One minor set-back was Congress' refusal to continue authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to act as a secondary market for loans partly guaranteed by the Government under the GI bill of rights. The Home Builders Association protested the action and a move has started in the Senate to restore the powers.

Under constant fire from the real-estate organizations, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has progressed only as far as approval by the Senate Banking Committee. It is doubtful if the measure will reach a Senate vote this year, and its rejection by the House is conceded. Chief target of the lobby is the provision for Government subsidies to 500,000 homes for low-income families.

A House petition started by Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS (Democrat, California) has failed to produce the signatures necessary to force a vote on the TEW bill.

The House for the second time has rejected a reorganization plan of President Truman calling for a cover-all branch to be known as the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Senate Banking Committee approved the plan by a one-vote margin, but rejection by the Senate is being predicted. Designed to group all agencies dealing with housing under a

single head the plan has been fought actively by the real-estate groups.

The same groups are supporting a bill by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER (Republican, Ohio) to reestablish the Federal Housing Agency and Federal Home Loan Bank Administration as independent units. Both agencies are among those now grouped under the National Housing Agency, which the lobby wants abolished.

FPHA UNDER FIRE

Real-estate spokesmen have appeared in support of a bill by Senators HARRY P. CAIN (Republican, Washington) and RICHARD B. RUSSELL (Democrat, Georgia) to abolish NHA and one of its subsidiaries, Federal Public Housing Authority.

FPHA, which handles public housing built before the war, has been under fire from many sides. Its administrative budget was chopped $5,000,000 in Congress, and funds available for low-rent subsidies was cut by a like amount. Since the agency might handle any new public-housing program, the real-estate lobby wants it put out of business.

Congress recently cut $14,500,000 from the $50,000,000 requested for FPHA's completion of temporary homes for rental to veterans. The Home Builders' Association had opposed the program, saying the units converted from wartime barracks were only shacks.

The Cain-Russell bill proposes to transfer the disposal of surplus war housing from FPHA to the Federal Works Agency. The House has passed a bill by Representative WOLCOTT accomplishing this result. The measure would require that housing worth about $750,000,000 be sold for cash by the end of 1948, a provision which opponents say would limit sales to real-estate interests with plenty of ready capital or borrowing power.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 176. An act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions; to establish the National Institute of Dental Research; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1064. An act relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1042. An act to provide for the completion of Mount Rushmore National Memorial and the financing thereof by issuance of a special coin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1116. An act to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army and Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1304. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the organization of Minnesota as a Territory of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1305. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Power Act so as to provide that the States may apply for reservation of portions of power sites released for entry, location, or selection to the States for highway purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1543. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1614. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the patriotic services of Gen. Maurice Rose and to perpetuate the General Rose Memorial Hospital as a historic shrine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1648. An act to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1721. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of injuries sustained by G. R. Below, late of Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 72. An act to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 185. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic Society of Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 197. An act to transfer part of block 14 and the school building thereon of Petersburg town site, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska;

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 348. An act for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block;

H. R. 405. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss;

H. R. 406. An act for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall;

H. R. 434. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Rich;

H. R. 640. An act for the relief of Harley Shores;

H. R. 673. An act to repeal certain provisions authorizing the establishing of priorities in transportation by merchant vessels;

H. R. 704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 893. An act for the relief of Myron R. Leard;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanser;

H. R. 1238. An act to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 1341. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.;

H. R. 1379. An act to establish the United States Naval Postgratuate School, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1497. An act for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor;

H. R. 1565. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title I of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions";

H. R. 1566. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States";

H. R. 1567. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds";

H. R. 1633. An act to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia";

H. R. 1652. An act to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers;

H. R. 1714. An act to exclude certain interns, student nurses, and other student-employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation and benefits of Federal employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of Owen R. Brewster;

H. R. 1995. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service;

H. R. 2005. An act to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations, in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments";

H. R. 2054. An act to amend the act of April 14, 1930, to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the former Life Saving Service;

H. R. 2083. An act to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 2084. An act to codify and enact into positive law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration";

H. R. 2109. An act to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Elmer A. Norris;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston;

H. R. 2471. An act to provide for periodical reimbursement of the general fund of the District of Columbia for certain expenditures made for the compensation, uniforms, equipment, and other expenses of the United States Park Police force;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp;

H. R. 2511. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim two acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church;

H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor;

H. R. 2693. An act for the relief of public utility district No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.;

H. R. 2800. An act to amend section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3022. An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States;

H. R. 3043. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3055. An act 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;

H. R. 3075. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors;

H. R. 3127. An act to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 3131. An act to extend for 3 months the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River;

H. R. 3361. An act for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford;

H. R. 3376. An act to ratify and confirm act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3444. An act to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3448. An act to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3495. An act for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson;

H. R. 3541. An act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3619. An act relating to the sale of the Mission Point Lighthouse Reservation, Grand Traverse County, Mich.;

H. R. 3738. An act to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945;

H. R. 3739. An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to acquire certain land as a site for the proposed Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3818. An act to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3852. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946;

H. R. 3997. An act to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 4043. An act to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4079. An act to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976);

H. R. 4084. An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments;

H. R. 4254. An act providing for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers.

H. R. 4268. An act making supplemental appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert V. Fleming as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 338. An act to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding a new proviso to section 1.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Robert V. Fleming as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

H. R. 185. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic Society of Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 197. An act to transfer part of block 14 and the school building thereon of Petersburg townsite, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska;

H. R. 341. An act for the relief of the estate of Reuben Malkin;

H. R. 348. An act for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block;

H. R. 405. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss;

H. R. 406. An act for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall;

H. R. 434. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Rich;

H. R. 640. An act for the relief of Harley Shores;

H. R. 704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Sherman and W. D. Sherman;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 893. An act for the relief of Myron R. Leard;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of George Corenevsky;

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lauser;

H. R. 1379. An act to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1497. An act for the relief of the estate of George W. Coombs;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor;

H. R. 1652. An act to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of Owen R. Brewster;

H. R. 1995. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service;

H. R. 2005. An act to amend the act of April 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 88), entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations, in Oklahoma, and for an extension of time within which purchasers of such deposits may complete payments";

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Elmer A. Norris;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston;

H. R. 2471. An act to provide for periodical reimbursement of the general fund of the District of Columbia for certain expenditures made for the compensation, uniforms, equipment, and other expenses of the United States Park Police force;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp;

H. R. 2511. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim 2 acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church;

H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor;

H. R. 2693. An act for the relief of public utility district No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.;

H. R. 2800. An act to amend section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3055. An act 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;

H. R. 3075. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors;

H. R. 3123. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3127. An act to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 3131. An act to extend for 3 months the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of Roman Toporow;

H. R. 3334. An act granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River;

H. R. 3361. An act for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford;

H. R. 3376. An act to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3444. An act to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3448. An act to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3495. An act for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson;

H. R. 3738. An act to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945;

H. R. 3739. An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to acquire certain land as a site for the proposed Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3852. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946;

H. R. 3997. An act to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 4043. An act to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4079. An act to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976); and

H. R. 4254. An act providing for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. 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, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, July 26, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

978. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated Janu-

ary 2, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the intracoastal waterway from the Mississippi River at New Orleans, La., to Corpus Christi, Tex. (alternate connection with the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Algiers, La.), requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 30, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

979. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 27, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Mississippi River at Maiden Rock, Wis., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

980. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 16, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cox (Coxes) Creek, tributary of Stony Creek, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

981. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of proposed transfer of equipment to the Ex-Navy-Army Personnel Boating Club; to the Committee on Armed Services.

982. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting request for withdrawal of the case of Adeline Chagnon Shapiro from those 74 cases involving suspension of deportation referred to in letter of July 1, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

983. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

984. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 23, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Clear Fork of the Mohican River, in Richland County, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

985. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Pinconning River, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

986. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 13, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Dunlap Creek and tributaries, Pennsylvania, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

987. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 27, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Bunganuc Creek, Maquoit (Maquoite) Bay, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

988. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on flood control on the Missouri River at Bismarck, N. Dak., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 2, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

989. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 13, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of channel to Hog Island, Hingham Bay, Mass., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

990. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report presented to the Secretary of the Interior by the Bureau of Reclamation of this Department on July 21, 1947, on the Coachella Valley division, All-American Canal system, Boulder Canyon project, California (H. Doc. No. 415); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

991. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, relative to the contest of election of Helen Gahagan Douglas (H. Doc. No. 416); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

992. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an audit of the various Government corporations supervised by the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 417); to the Committtee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments 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. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 317. Resolution providing expenses for the conducting of studies, investigations, and inquiry to be conducted by the Committee on Agriculture pursuant to House Resolution 298; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1077).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 303. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 141; without amendment (Rept. No. 1078).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 259. Resolution providing expenses for conducting the investigations and surveys authorized by House Resolution 211 of the Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1079).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 331. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 295; without amendment (Rept. No. 1080).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 332. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 296; without amendment (Rept. No. 1081).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 333. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1082).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 334. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1083).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 335. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 111; without amendment (Rept. No. 1084).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 264. Resolution providing for the printing as a House document "Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States," and "Report of Proposed Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1085).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 207. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (h) (1); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1086).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 297. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 293; without amendment (Rept. No. 1087).

Mr. SUNDSTROM: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 336. Resolution providing additional compensation for certain employees of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1088).

Mr. GAMBLE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 339. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 338; without amendment (Rept. No. 1089).

Mr. BISHOP: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial; without amendment (Rept. No. 1090).

Mr. LOVE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4236. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1092). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 144. Joint resolution authorizing the President to bring into effect an agreement between the United States and the United Nations for the purpose of establishing the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the United States and authorizing the taking of measures necessary to facilitate compliance with the provisions of such agreement, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1093). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 612. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1094). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3930. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1096). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VURSELL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1324. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind; without amendment (Rept. No. 1098). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 221. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers; with amendments (Rept.

No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PLOESER: Select Committee on Small Business. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 18, Eightieth Congress, first session, directing an investigation of domestic shortages of critical nonferrous metals (Rept. No. 1101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PLOESER: Select Committee on Small Business. Report pursuant to H. R. 18, on Federal barge lines (Rept. No. 1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4395. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1105). 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. WEICHEL:

H. R. 4385. A bill to authorize the President of the United States of America to direct the United States Maritime Commission to charter certain vessels to persons not citizens of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 4386. A bill to authorize the Army engineers to investigate and determine the feasibility of dredging the Colorado River from the Gulf of California to the Imperial Dam, and of constructing such necessary locks and other facilities for the purpose of creating an inland harbor for national-defense purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 4387. A bill to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to effectuate collective-bargaining agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana (by request):

H. R. 4388. A bill to amend section 2883 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 4389. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to relieve the Legislative Reference Service of the preparation of data in certain cases; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4390. A bill to amend the Social Security Act by providing for a national system of unemployment and temporary disability insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4391. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 4392. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 4393. A bill to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4394. A bill to empower the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way for various purposes across lands of individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 4395. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4396. A bill to limit the pool elevation and the size of dikes for the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4397. A bill to equalize the retirement benefits payable to Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to a quorum in either House of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to reestablish effective price and rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the reparations owed by Finland to the Soviet Union should be satisfied out of funds the Soviet Union owes to the United States under the Lend-Lease Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the proceedings held in commemoration of the centennial of the telegraph, May 24, 1944, provided by House Concurrent Resolution 72, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution authorizing international cooperation to raise social-security protection standards for seamen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress of the United States with respect to admission in the United States of nationals of the Soviet Union and the admission into the Soviet Union of nationals of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. Res. 341. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the real-estate lobby and other pressure groups; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 342. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 341; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 343. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to have printed additional copies of hearings held before a special subcommittee relative to the agricultural and economic problems of the Cotton Belt; to the Committee on House Administration.

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 Missouri, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the office of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 4398. A bill for the relief of Harvey M. Lifset, formerly a major in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 4399. A bill for the relief of James C. Smith, Charles A. Marlin, Andrew J. Perlik, and Albert N. James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 4400. A bill for the relief of Ben Grunstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 4401. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Doelman and two sons Johannes and Fransiscus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 4402. A bill for the relief of Louis Esposito, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 4403. A bill for the relief of Ladislao Vaida, Elena Vaida, and Stefano Vaida; 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:

765. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Resolution of Twenty-ninth Division Association, Veterans of World Wars I and II, recommending the passage by the Congress of the United States of a National Security Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

766. Also, resolution of Twenty-ninth Division Association, Veterans of World Wars I and II, recommending the enactment by the Congress of the United States of an Inter-American Military Cooperation Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

767. Also, resolution of approving and recommending the adoption by the Congress of the United States of legislation to provide for the universal military training of young men of the Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

768. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. W. Waring, secretary, Townsend Club No. 1, 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.

769. Also, petition of A. M. Keller, Tampa, 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.

770. Also, petition of Jose Norat Rodriguez, Ponce, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to disapproval of the bill for an elective governor; to the Committee on Public Lands.

771. Also, petition of Paul Drew, Pittsburgh, Pa., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request to amend the armed forces unification bill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the following reports were received by the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
July 17, 1947.

In compliance with section 134 (b) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, I am submitting the following report on the personnel employed by the Committee on Agriculture, covering the period of January 3, 1947, through June 30, 1947.

CLERICAL

Name	Position	Gross salary	Date of employment
George L. Reid, Jr.	Clerk	$9,129.12	Jan. 14 to June 30, 1947.
Katherine Wheeler	Assistant clerk	5,392.20	Feb. 1 to June 30, 1947.
Mae Toole	Stenographer	3,805.80	Feb. 4 to June 30, 1947.
Geraldine W. Eaker	do	3,212.74	Feb. 1 to June 10, 1947.
Mary Elizabeth Laxton	do	3,323.10	May 1 to June 30, 1947.
Lorraine Adamson	do	3,047.22	June 23 to June 30, 1947.

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Joseph O. Parker	Attorney	$9,129.12	Jan. 14 to June 30, 1947.
John J. Heimburger	Research specialist	8,536.56	Jan. 16 to June 30, 1947.
Hugh H. Soper	do	7,022.40	Apr. 7 to June 30, 1947.

Funds appropriated: None.

Very sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD R. HOPE.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,

July 24, 1947.

There is submitted herewith a report showing the name, title, and total salary paid to the members of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations as required under the provisions of section 134b of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, for the period beginning January 3, 1947, and ending June 30, 1947.

Committee employee report submitted in compliance with sec. 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1948, for the period Jan. 3, 1947, to June 30, 1947

Name of employee	Title	Dates of employment	Gross annual salary	Gross paid in period	Total gross paid in period
John C. Pugh	Clerk	Jan. 3 to 31	$10,000.00	$777.79	$4,111.11
Do	Clerk emeritus	Feb. 1 to May 31	10,000.00	3,333.32	
George Y. Harvey	Assistant clerk	Jan. 3 to 31	10,000.00	777.79	4,944.44
Do	Clerk	Feb. 1 to June 30	10,000.00	4,166.65	
Kenneth Sprankle	Assistant clerk	Jan. 17 to 31	8,997.45	349.89	4,516.54
Do	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	10,000.00	4,166.65	
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk	Jan. 3 to 31	8,997.45	689.80	4,438.70
Do	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	8,997.45	3,748.90	
Arthur Orr	Assistant clerk	Jan. 3 to June 30	8,997.45	4,438.70	4,438.70
Jack K. McFall	do	Jan. 3 to Feb. 18	8,997.45	1,139.57	1,139.57
Corbal D. Orescan	do	Jan. 3 to 16	8,339.10	324.29	4,423.08
Do	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	8,997.45	4,098.79	
Robert E. Lambert	do	Jan. 3 to 16	8,339.10	324.29	4,423.08
Do	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	8,997.45	4,098.79	
Robert P. Williams	do	Jan. 3 to 16	7,022.40	273.09	4,071.98
Do	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	8,339.10	3,798.89	
Paul M. Wilson	do	Feb. 9 to June 30	8,339.10	3,289.27	3,289.27
Claude Hobbs, Jr.	do	Feb. 11 to June 30	5,668.08	2,204.24	2,204.24
Bert J. Skinnard	Clerk-stenographer	Jan. 3 to 16	4,288.68	166.77	2,497.54
Do	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	5,116.32	2,330.77	
Lawrence C. Miller	do	Jan. 3 to 16	3,461.04	134.59	2,088.31
Do	do	Jan. 17 to June 30	4,288.68	1,953.72	
Earl C. Silsby	do	Feb. 16 to June 30	2,633.40	987.52	987.52
John D. Cook	do	Feb. 19 to June 30	2,633.40	965.58	965.58
William J. Strachan	Page	Jan. 17 to May 31	2,218.24	993.02	993.02
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger-file clerk	Jan. 3 to June 30	2,881.69	1,424.84	1,424.84
Richard J. Denney	Clerk-stenographer, substitute	Jan. 10 to June 30	3,461.04	1,643.99	1,643.99
E. S. Plumley	do	Jan. 7 to Apr. 30	3,461.04	1,095.99	1,095.99
F. D. Plumley	do	May 1 to June 30	3,461.04	576.84	576.84
Dorothy Davis	do	Jan. 8 to June 30	3,461.04	1,663.21	1,663.21
Jessemine N. Bennett	do	Jan. 7 to Apr. 30	3,461.04	1,095.79	1,095.79
Eleanor L. Fox	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	3,461.04	1,442.10	1,442.10
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	do	Feb. 2 to June 30	3,461.04	1,432.47	1,432.47
Marjorie H. VanRiper	do	Mar. 1 to June 30	3,461.04	1,153.68	1,153.68
Veronica Strozak	do	May 15 to June 30	3,461.04	442.23	442.23
Helen H. Kayser	do	Jan. 7 to 31	3,461.04	230.73	807.57
Do	do	Mar. 1 to Apr. 30	3,461.04	576.84	

Summary: Available at gross rates, $73,990.89; total gross paid including increased pay authorized by the Federal Employees Pay Acts of 1945 and 1946, $62,311.39.

Special investigating committee under Appropriations Committee

REGULAR EMPLOYEES

Name of employee	Title	Dates of employment	Gross annual salary	Gross paid in period	Total gross paid in period
Robert E. Lee	Chief investigator	Jan. 3 to 31	$8,602.44	$669.06	$4,417.96
Do	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	8,997.36	3,748.90	
James J. Kerr	Investigator	do	7,022.40	2,926.00	2,926.00
Harris H. Huston	do	Feb. 13 to June 30	7,022.40	2,691.92	2,691.92
Harry S. Barger	do	Feb. 1 to June 30	7,022.40	2,926.00	2,926.00
Jay B. Howe	do	Feb. 14 to June 30	7,022.40	2,672.42	2,672.42
Enid Morrison	Legal clerk	Feb. 17 to June 30	4,288.68	1,596.33	1,596.33
Jean E. Morrow	Clerk-stenographer	Feb. 1 to June 30	2,909.28	1,212.20	1,212.20
Mildred E. Emerson	do	Mar. 10 to June 30	2,633.40	796.96	796.96

PER DIEM EMPLOYEES

Gilbert H. Clee	Investigator	Feb. 14 to Apr. 2	[1] $15		$1,002.55
John M. Dunnick	do	Feb. 24 to Mar. 20	[1] 15		629.09
Thomas J. Graves	do	Feb. 25, to Mar. 15	[1] 15		398.42
Arthur E. Hald	do	Feb. 17 to Apr. 21	[1] 15		1,338.05
Thomas J. Quinn	do	Feb. 17 to Mar. 31	[1] 15		897.70
Homer E. Scace	do	Feb. 18 to May 16	[1] 15		1,799.37
Wilfred H. Sigerson	do	Feb. 24 to June 30	[1] 25		3,472.20
U. Howard Friend	do	Mar. 17 to May 3	[1] 15		1,004.60
Claude S. Holloway	do	Mar. 17 to May 9	[1] 15		794.89
Ronald M. Ketcham	do	Mar. 13 to Apr. 17	[1] 15		752.43
A. Rea Long	do	Mar. 3 to May 23	[1] 15		1,715.75
William H. Courtney	do	Mar. 13 to 23	[1] 15		230.66
Lewis C. Dorweiler	do	Mar. 3 to May 5	[1] 15		1,342.06
George A. Hewitt	do	Mar. 25 to May 9	[1] 15		440.35
J. William Hope	do	Mar. 3 to May 3	[1] 15		671.02
Edward A. Krake	do	Mar. 3 to Apr. 17	[1] 15		650.06
E. B. Nutt	do	Mar. 27 to Apr. 30	[1] 15		733.94
Jacob S. Siedman	do	Mar. 18 to May 5	[1] 15		314.55

[1] Per day base (while actually employed).

Special investigating committee under Appropriations Committee—Continued

PER DIEM EMPLOYEES—continued

Name of employee	Title	Dates of employment	Gross annual salary	Gross paid in period	Total gross paid in period
L. H. Sanderman	Investigator	Mar. 25 to Apr. 30	[1] $15		$775.88
Charles H. Towns	do	Mar. 18 to May 3	[1] 15		335.52
Clarence L. Turner	do	Mar. 1 to May 14	[1] 15		650.04
Carman G. Blough	do	Mar. 5 to May 3	[1] 15		482.30
C. Oliver Wellington	do	Mar. 18 to Apr. 3	[1] 15		146.78
G. W. Blair	do	Mar. 18 to Apr. 11	[1] 15		356.47
Elmer C. Upton	do	Mar. 1 to 19	[1] 15		419.38
W. B. Correll	do	Apr. 24 to June 6	[1] 15		918.66
Robert D. Hammer	do	Apr. 2 to 30	[1] 15		608.10
William J. McGlone	do	Apr. 18 to May 21	[1] 15		712.96
Arthur B. Roberts	do	May 1 to June 11	[1] 15		876.73
Virginia S. Kup	Stenographer	May	[1] 5.55		169.71
Mary K. Scott	do	May 1 to 12	[1] 5.55		96.97
Janet S. Parrish	do	May 1 to 15	[1] 5.55		121.22

[1] Per day base (while actually employed).

Summary on special investigating committee

Appropriation for 80th Cong	$76,204.03
Expended for salaries	44,096.20
Expended for travel and expenses	6,196.45
Total expenditure	50,294.65
Balance unexpended June 20, 1947	25,909.38

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN TABER, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,

July 19, 1947.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 134 (b) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, herewith is reported the name, profession, basic and gross salary of each person employed by the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, during the period January 3–June 30, 1947:

Name	Profession	Per annum basic salary	Gross salary from Jan. 3 to June 30, inclusive
Robert H. Harper	Chief Clerk	$6,500	$3,954.93
John Russell Blandford	Professional staff	5,800	3,238.10
Clinton B. D. Brown	do	5,800	3,160.07
Bryce N. Harlow	do	5,800	3,238.10
Robert W. Smart	do	5,800	3,238.10
Townsend Hoopes	Assistant clerk	4,300	2,821.30
Agnes H. Johnston	Stenographer	2,500	1,669.50
Berniece Kalinowski	do	2,400	1,480.55
Rosemary Curry	do	2,400	1,406.98
James A. Deakins	Assistant clerk	2,000	614.18

No funds having been made available to this committee during the period January 3–June 30, 1947, no such funds have been expended.

Sincerely,

W. G. ANDREWS, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,

June 30, 1947.

In compliance with section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, there is herewith reported the names, official capacity, and basic salary of the members of the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee:

Clerical staff:

William J. Hallahan, clerk	$4,500
Elsie L. Gould, deputy clerk	3,800
Margaret Park, assistant clerk	2,100

Professional staff:

Orman S. Fink, staff director	5,550

Respectfully yours,

JESSE P. WOLCOTT, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

July 18, 1947.

As required by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, I am submitting the pay rolls for the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives for the first quarter. This covers the expenditures of the committee since there are no special appropriations.

January 1947:

William N. McLeod, Jr.	$449.35
Mary C. Harrell	233.24
Gladys E. Quick	219.45

February 1947:

Mabel G. Haller	$694.92
William N. McLeod, Jr. (clerk to the minority)	585.20
Ruth Pingley	357.39

March 1947:

Mabel G. Haller	694.92
William N. McLeod, Jr. (clerk to the minority)	585.20
Ruth Pingley	357.39
Parker Jackson (2 months' appointment)	833.33
Harriett G. Mossburg (temporary)	154.91

As required by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, I am submitting the pay rolls for the District of Columbia Committee for the second quarter. This covers the expenditures of the committee since there were no special appropriations until House Resolution 195 became law.

April 1947:

Mabel G. Haller, executive secretary	$694.92
William N. McLeod, Jr., minority clerk	585.20
Ruth Pingley, committee stenographer	357.39
Harriett G. Mossburg, typist (temporary)	154.91
Parker Jackson,[1] tax specialist	833.33
Ann Elizabeth Coker,[1] stenographer for tax specialist	129.30

May 1947:

Mabel G. Haller, executive secretary	694.92
William N. McLeod, Jr., minority clerk	585.20
Ruth Pingley, committee stenographer	$357.39
Harriett G. Mossburg, typist (temporary)	154.91
Parker Jackson,[1] tax specialist	833.33
Ann Elizabeth Coker,[1] stenographer for tax specialist	242.44
Clarence Pierce,[2] specialist, home-rule study	592.72

June 1947:

Mabel G. Haller, executive secretary	694.92
William N. McLeod, Jr., minority clerk	585.20
Ruth Pingley, committee stenographer	357.39
Harriett G. Mossburg, typist (temporary)	154.91
Parker Jackson,[1] tax specialist	833.33
Samuel J. Fusco,[1] statistical tax clerk (temporary)	242.44
Ann Elizabeth Coker,[2] stenographer, home-rule study	242.44
Clarence Pierce,[2] specialist, home-rule study	683.95

[1] Charged to Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee.

[2] Charged to Home Rule and Reorganization Subcommittee; transferred to voucher pay roll.

Sincerely,

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,

July 22, 1947.

Complying with section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, I am submitting herewith the names and salaries of the employees of the Committee on Education and Labor, together with the funds expended under our special appropriation. The employees are:

W. Manly Sheppard, Chief Clerk	$10,000.00
Irving G. McCann, chief counsel, (professional staff)	10,000.00
F. Albert Reiman, assistant clerk (professional staff)	10,000.00
Frank S. McArthur, investigator (professional staff)	10,000.00
Bingham W. Mathias, minority clerk (professional staff)	10,000.00
Jennie Ward Carter, clerk-stenographer	4,867.92
Mary Pauline Smith, clerk-stenographer	4,867.92
Mary Ellen Gilbert, clerk-stenographer	4,867.92
Myrtle S. Locher, clerk-stenographer	4,867.92
Frances A. Los, clerk-stenographer (minority)	4,867.92

Special employees pursuant to H. Res. 111:

Henry A. Bates, investigator	$8,500.00
Agnes Ainilian, clerk-stenographer	4,867.92

Pursuant to House Resolution 111, the House appropriated $40,000 for a special investigation of racketeering in labor unions. As of June 30, $10,808.96 had been spent. Under this resolution three special subcommittees have been appointed, but they have no additional personnel and have not expended any funds other than those recorded herein.

Trusting this is the information you desire, I am

Very sincerely yours,

FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

(January through June 30, 1947)

	Base pay
Carl E. Hoffman, professional	$6,000
William A. Young, professional	5,000
Francis T. O'Donnell, professional	5,000
Annabell Zue, chief clerk	4,000
Martha Crawley, clerk	3,500
Betty Henderson, clerk	2,600
Delores Fel'Dotto, clerk	2,700
Carl H. Monsees (May 7 through July 12), clerical	7,000
Mildred Calhoun (2 weeks, professional)	7,300
Hazel Huffman (investigator)	4,620

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXTRA LEGAL ACTIVITIES IN DEPARTMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Total appropriations, $40,000.

(Expenses—April to July 1, 1947)

Carl E. Hoffman, expenses	$22.08
Francis O'Donnell:	
Expenses	38.57
Do	35.85
W. J. Bryan Dorn, expenses	78.92
Martha Crawley, expenses	41.64
Shorthand Service Bureau, reporting	381.15
Carl E. Hoffman:	
Transportation and expenses	18.00
Expenses	18.87
Do	30.05
Do	93.70
George B. Murphy, expenses	79.14
Francis T. O'Donnell, expenses	23.90
Samuel C. Travis, expenses	66.20
Annabell Zue, postage	20.00
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., services	24.10
Electronic Engineering Co., Inc., rental	60.00
Alderson Reporting Co., reporting	150.90
Hazel Huffman, expenses	188.23
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co	7.05
Do	16.60
Helen M. Balog, research and stenographic	40.00
Total	1,434.95

Total remaining, $38,565.05.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

SURPLUS PROPERTY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
July 22, 1947.

The Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, created pursuant to House Resolution 100, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by it during the period from January 3 to June 30, 1947, together with the funds appropriated to and expended by it:

Margaret B. Campbell (resigned June 22), stenographer, gross annual salary	$2,633.40
Edmond J. Donohue, Jr., associate counsel, gross annual salary	6,522.05
Edward E. Fine, Jr. (from Apr. 1), investigator, gross annual salary	2,467.87
Herbert S. French (Apr. 14 through June 16), special counsel, gross salary per day	27.77
Anna-Marie Hogin, stenographer, gross annual salary	3,626.56
Blanche M. LeMan (from June 16), gross annual salary	3,461.04
Joseph C. Lewis, associate counsel, gross annual salary	5,881.88
George V. McDavitt (from Mar. 3), investigator, gross annual salary	5,881.88
Winifred A. Meyerson (resigned June 30), stenographer, gross annual salary	3,116.19
Paul F. Morrison (from Mar. 24), investigator, gross annual salary	5,392.20
George L. Quinn, Jr., associate counsel, gross annual salary	6,522.05
Kathryn E. Smith, chief clerk, gross annual salary	4,219.71
Elmer B. Solomon (from Mar. 12), consultant, gross salary per day	24.92
Charles G. Tomerlin (from Mar. 17), consultant, gross salary per day	27.77
Hugh D. Wise, Jr. (resigned June 30), general counsel, gross annual salary	9,919.10

Funds appropriated, $50,000.
Funds expended, $36,929.81.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS RIZLEY,
Chairman, Surplus Property Subcommittee.

EXPENDITURES OF PROCUREMENT AND BUILDINGS SUBCOMMITTEE

(May 1–Aug. 1, 1947)

Staff as of Aug. 1, 1947:	
Coleman Rosenberger, counsel, May 1–July 31, 1947, at $4,250 per annum gross	$6,012.93
Fritzie P. Manuel, investigator, May 1–July 31, 1947, at $4,250 per annum gross	6,012.93
Clara D. Terry, clerk, May 1–July 31, 1947, at $3,540 per annum gross	5,033.55
Kathleen H. Hart, stenographer, May 19–July 31, 1947, at $2,090 per annum gross	3,033.42
Previous staff members:	
Chet E. Sinclair, staff director, May 3–June 16, 1947, at $5,800 per annum gross	8,075.76
Robert L. Zimler, investigator, June 9–July 31, 1947, at $4,250 per annum gross	6,012.93
Regina H. McLean, stenographer, May 12–24, 1947, at $2,090 per annum gross	3,033.42
Expenses:	
Stenographically reporting hearings, June 3 and 4, 1947	130.00
Supplies, stationery room, May 5–27	53.45
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., June 19–25	13.63

Balance, June 30, 1947, $35,338.94.

GEORGE H. BENDER, *Chairman.*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS [1]

June 30, 1947

Salaries:		
May:		
Frank T. Bow, general counsel		$803.55
Oscar Lewis Hume, investigator		150.32
Pansy G. Haines, clerk		180.61
June:		
Frank T. Bow, general counsel		803.55
Oscar Lewis Hume, investigator		501.07
Pansy G. Haines, clerk		225.57
Stationery room:		
May: According to statement (which agrees with the records)		41.86
June: According to my records, $33.25; but the stationery room had an item for mimeograph ink, purchased by Barbara Yeaple, $1, which makes a total of		34.25
Pansy G. Haines, May:		
Calendars purchased in the Senate stationery room, as the House stationery room had none and said they would not have any for the year 1947		3.74
3 registered letters		.60
O. L. Hume, investigator:		
June 4, 1947, cash payment for photostating of St. Paul, Minn., newspapers, in connection with the St. Paul Workshop meeting		1.10
June, Atlantic City, 2 days, at $6		12.00
Frank T. Bow, general counsel, June:		
Atlantic City, 2 days, at $6; transportation (use of automobile), 170 miles at $0.05 a mile, round trip, $17; taxi fare, $3		26.00
Petty cash		10.00
Gwen Rhys: Stenographic services rendered, June 25		10.00
Lawrence Sullivan: research		150.00
Sound Studios, Inc., Washington, D. C., June 16		10.50
E. F. Engebretson: June 18, witness at hearing		181.23
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co, statement		16.44
Alderson Reporting Co.: Following information received over the telephone, by P. G. H., July 22, 1947, no statements having been received at H. O. B., room 535, subcommittee address. The company bookkeeper reports that one statement (for May 28) was sent to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, included with a charge for work done for the latter committee:		
Hearing, May 28	$99.00	
Hearing, June 18	84.90	
Hearing, June 20	51.60	
Hearing, June 16	41.70	
		277.20
Total		3,439.59

H. Res. 197 authorizes an expenditure of $26,000.00

June 30, 1947: Amount spent to date, or being processed [1] $3,439.59

Balance 22,560.41

[1] The items herein set forth have been expended or are being processed for payment.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
July 21, 1947.

In accordance with your letter of July 15, I wish to advise that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has neither received nor disbursed any funds during the period January 1 through June 30, 1947.

The present committee personnel is as follows:

William Y. Elliott, staff director. Services provided by Library of Congress.

	Salary per annum
Boyd Crawford, administrative officer	$10,000.00
George Pettee, professional staff member	10,000.00
Charles Burton Marshall, professional staff member	10,000.00
John Easton, professional staff member	10,000.00
June Nigh, clerical staff member	4,288.68
Winifred Osborne, clerical staff member	5,016.32
Doris Leone, clerical staff member	4,288.68
Mabel Henderson, clerical staff member	3,047.22

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
July 1, 1947.

In accordance with section 134 (b), rule XII, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, the following information is submitted with reference to the name, profession, and total salary of each member of the staff of the Committee on House Administration as of June 30, 1947:

1. Marjorie Savage, clerk; basic salary, $4,500; gross salary, $6,357.78.

2. Frank Specht, assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Accounts; basic salary, $4,300; gross salary, $6,081.90.

3. Jack Watson, assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Enrolled Bills, Library, Disposition of Executive Papers and Memorials, basic salary, $4,300; gross salary, $6,081.90.

4. Irene Gilchrist, assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Elections; basic salary, $2,500; gross salary, $3,598.98.

5. Gladys Riggs, assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Printing; basic salary, $2,500; gross salary, $3,598.98.

6. Maureen Sandiford, assistant clerk and stenographer; basic salary, $2,500; gross salary, $3,598.98.

7. Dennis A. Lyons, counsel to Subcommittee on Elections; basic salary, $5,000; gross salary, $7,022.40.

Sincerely yours,

K. M. LECOMPTE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
July 17, 1947.

In response to your letter of July 15, I have the following to submit under the provisions of section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946:

CLERICAL STAFF

Name	Title	Base salary	Total salary
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$7,500	$10,000.00
(Mrs.) Marjorie A. Biddle	Assistant clerk	3,000	4,288.68
Royice Reno	do	3,000	4,288.68
(Mrs.) Margaret H. Smith-Burns	Assistant clerk-stenographer	2,820	4,040.38
(Miss) Georgia G. Glasmann	do	2,820	4,040.38
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	2,000	2,909.28

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Arlin E. Stockburger	Aviation and engineering consultant	$8,000	$10,000.00
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	8,000	10,000.00
Kurt Borchardt	Professional assistant	5,800	8,075.76
Dr. John H. Frederick	Consultant	5,200	7,285.68

The above information covering the period ending June 30, 1947, is identical with that submitted in my memorandum to you of April 24.

Under House Resolution 163, appropriating $25,000 for the transportation survey, the following personnel was appointed: (Miss) Pauline E. Mickelsen, clerk-stenographer; base salary, $2,820; total salary, $4,040.38.

Also the additional following amounts have been expended from that appropriation:

On a trip the members made to California in connection with the committee's investigation of safety in air navigation:

April 12, 1947, the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles	$744.36
Reimbursement to clerk of the committee for expenditures from April 7 to 12, inclusive	265.77
To the landing aids experimental station, Arcata, Calif	64.54

On a trip the members made June 10 to 12, inclusive, to New York in connection with aviation accidents:

Reimbursement to Congressman Leonard W. Hall	$29.31
Hotel Lexington, New York City	123.91
Reimbursement to A. E. Stockburger, member of professional staff	20.50

I trust the above information is what you desire.

With kind personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
July 15, 1947.

Pursuant to direction contained in section 134 (b) of the Reorganization Act of 1946, I submit herewith a list of the employees on the clerical and professional staffs of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, as of July 15, 1947, together with the gross compensation of each employee:

CLERICAL STAFF

Name	Title	Yearly salary
C. Murray Bernhardt	Chief clerk	$8,997.45
Velma Smedley	Assistant chief clerk	8,339.10
Walter M. Besterman	Clerk-stenographer	4,978.38
Eileen R. Browne	do	4,080.12
Harriet R. Booker	do	4,080.12
Frances Christy	do	3,736.92

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Walter R. Lee	Assistant specialist	$7,022.40

JULY 25, 1947.

On July 15, 1947, I rendered you a report pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Reorganization Act of 1946. I wish to supplement this report by adding the following item of expenditure:

Moneys expended from January 1–July 26, 1947, from a special appropriation for preparation of new edition of United States Code, $49,459.54.

Sincerely yours,

EARL C. MICHENER, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Personnel of period January 3 to June 30, 1947

Name of employee	Title	Period of service	Annual rate, base salary	Annual rate, gross salary
Marvin J. Coles	Counsel, professional staff	Jan. 14 to June 30	$7,440	$10,000.00
Guy H. LaBounty	Investigator, professional staff	Feb. 1 to June 30	7,440	10,000.00
Elizabeth B. Bedell	Chief clerk, clerical staff	do	4,000	5,668.08
Kathryn H. Cole	Clerk, clerical staff	do	3,300	4,702.50
Mae H. Stewart	Assistant clerk, clerical staff	do	2,400	3,461.04
Marion S. Jensen	Clerk, clerical staff	May 1 to June 30	3,600	5,116.32

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries investigating funds

Amount authorized by H. Res. 87, Feb. 21, 1947	$50,000.00
Amount expended January 3 to June 30, 1947	2,203.03
Balance June 30, 1947	47,796.97

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
July 18, 1947.

In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 601, I give you below a report covering funds expended by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for the period beginning January 3, 1947, and ending June 30, 1947.

	Salary, annual base	Monthly gross	Gross—first quarter			Gross—second quarter		
			January	February	March	April	May	June
George M. Moore, chief counsel	$7,260	$833.17	----------	$416.58	$833.17	$833.17	$833.17	$833.17
Frederick C. Belen, counsel	6,000	694.92	----------	640.06	640.06	694.92	694.92	694.92
Lucy K. Daley, assistant clerk	2,800	334.40	----------	278.67	334.40	334.40	334.40	334.40
Elayne Morelle, stenographer	2,500	299.91	----------	239.91	299.91	299.91	299.91	299.91
Dorothy Francisco, stenographer	2,400	288.42	----------	----------	67.29	288.42	288.42	288.42
Margaret Barnes, stenographer	2,100	253.93	----------	----------	226.28	242.44	242.44	253.93

Funds expended under House Resolution 177

Subcommittee investigation trip to Atlanta, Ga., June 24 to June 29 (inclusive)—two Congressmen, one counsel:

Travel	$92.25
Hotel and incidentals $179.77 less $5.29	174.48

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. MOORE,
Chief Counsel.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
July 23, 1947.

Replying to your letters of July 15 and July 18, and in acordance with the statutes referred to by you, the following is a list of the names, professions, and total salaries per annum of the staff members of the Committee on Public Lands, for the period ending June 30, 1947:

Ernest A. Grant, clerk	$7,022.40
Claude E Ragan, assistant clerk	5,392.20
Nancy J. Arnold, assistant clerk	5,392.20
E. Forrest Reeve, assistant clerk	5,392.20

No money has yet been expended from the sum appropriated under House Resolution 94.

This information is as of June 30, 1947, and it will be noted that no professional staff members were employed as of that date.

Very sincerely yours,

RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
July 17, 1947.

In compliance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the following is a listing of the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by the Committee on Public Works:

Joseph H. McGann, Sr., professional staff member	$8,013.06
Robert F. McConnell, majority clerk	5,943.90
Joseph H. McGann, Jr., minority clerk	4,288.68
Mrs. Vera Watts, stenographer-clerk	4,978.38
Elaine H. Jackson, stenographer-clerk	4,978.38
Violet V. Schumacher, stenographer-clerk	4,978.38

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. DONDERO, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
July 17, 1947.

In compliance with instructions contained in section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, I am submitting herewith the report required:

Name and title:	*Total salary*
Snader, Lyle O., clerk	$10,000.00
Montgomery, Donald O., assistant clerk	5,943.96
Shaw, Humphrey Scott, minority clerk	5,419.78
Wright, Jane E., stenographer-assistant clerk	4,219.71

With kindest personal regards, and all good wishes for your continued success, I remain,

Sincerely,

LEO E. ALLEN, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
July 21, 1947.

In compliance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the following is a listing of the name, profession, and total gross salary of each staff member employed by the committee from January 22, 1947, and ending on June 30, 1947.

PROFESSIONAL

Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator	$4,416.64
Benjamin Mandel, director of research	2,779.68
Louis J. Russell, investigator	3,450.45
Donald T. Appell, investigator	2,428.56
	13,075.33

CLERICAL

John W. Carrington, minority clerk	$2,985.22
Anne D. Turner, file chief	2,804.99
Rosella A. Purdy, clerk-stenographer	1,894.16
Juliette P. Joray, clerk-stenographer	1,894.16
Margaret S. Kerwan, clerk-stenographer	1,894.16
Gladys A. Slack, clerk-stenographer	1,763.10
	13,235.79

In order to cover the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) of rule eleven incurred by the committee, House Resolution 77 for $50,000 was approved January 30, 1947, and House Resolution 152 for $50,000 on April 2, 1947. Of the $100,000 appropriated, $15,512.69 has been expended, leaving a balance of $84,487.31.

Very truly yours,

J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
July 17, 1947.

In accordance with your letter dated July 15, I am furnishing the following data concerning the personnel employed by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives:

Name and title:	*Gross salary*
Karl Standish, chief clerk	$10,000.00
Bessie N. Kenyon, assistant chief clerk	6,357.78
Lucile J. Porter, clerk	4,288.68
Frances Montanye, clerk	4,288.68
Harriet Oliver, clerk	4,288.68
George Turner, clerk	3,736.92
Casey M. Jones, professional aide	10,000.00
Victor C. Cole, professional aide	$10,000.00
Ida Rowan, professional aide	8,339.10

Status of fund authorized under House Resolution 120, passed March 6, 1947, and House Resolution 136, passed April 2, 1947:

Amount authorized	$25,000.00
Expended through June 30 (no salaries)	1,102.35
Balance	23,897.65

Very truly yours,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
July 21, 1947.

Pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Appropriation Act of 1947, I wish to report the name, profession, and total annual salary of each person employed by the Committee on Ways and Means for the period beginning January 3 and ending June 30, 1947, as follows:

CLERICAL STAFF

	Total annual salary
James A. Tawney, lawyer	$8,997.45
T. J. Polski (Schnitz), assistant clerk	7,022.45
Don E. Larson, stenographer and accountant	3,928.00
Gladys L. Kullberg, stenographer	3,792.09
Susan Taylor, stenographer	3,792.09
Margie Halsey, stenographer	3,185.16
Sam Hardy, messenger	2,222.00
Hughlon Green, messenger	2,222.00
Harry Parker, retired messenger	2,372.00

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Lynn B. Stratton, tax adviser	$10,000.00
Serge Benson, lawyer-economist	8,997.45
Charles W. Davis, lawyer	8,339.10

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD KNUTSON.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NEWSPRINT AND PAPER SUPPLY,
July 21, 1947.

In compliance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the following is a listing of the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by the Select Committee on Newsprint and Paper Supply:

Total appropriation (H. R. 59)	$25,000
Total expenditures as of June 30, 1947	3,173
Balance as of June 30, 1947	21,827

Alyce E. Warren, clerk, base salary, $2,100; gross salary, $3,047.22.

Sidney Freidberg, counsel; contract fee basis, not to exceed $3,000 per annum.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Newsprint and Paper Supply.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
July 19, 1947.

In compliance with section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the following accounting of funds is submitted for the period March 24, 1947, through June 30, 1947:

	Salary
M. W. Rowell, executive director	$2,694.43
Allen W. Maddren, assistant director	2,250.00
J. G. Crost, investigator	1,887.27
Leo Cullinane, investigator-research	1,587.34
Willis J. Ballinger, economic adviser	824.85
Grace F. Purdy, clerk	1,229.89
Arvilla Benson, stenographer	761.79
Gladys Flanagan, stenographer	761.79
Dorothy E. Henry, stenographer	461.90
Willie E. Foristel, stenographer	709.85
C. J. Reynolds, Jr., messenger	555.48
David C. Macdonald, special counsel	25.00
Total	13,749.59

OTHER EXPENDITURES

Transportation, members and staff	$1,617.93
Travel expenses, members and staff	1,359.43
Reporting service	1,325.24
Telephone	176.08
Telegraph	55.70
Newspapers and periodicals	52.90
Committee library	56.00
Stationery and supplies	184.60
Miscellaneous (stamps, petty cash, etc.)	44.74
Total	4,872.62
Grand total expended	18,622.21
Appropriation (H. Res. 18, 80th Cong.)	60,000.00
Total expenditures Mar. 24, 1947, through June 30, 1947	18,622.21
Balance unexpended	41,377.79

Respectfully,

WALTER C. PLOESER.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 16, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., minister emeritus, Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the alpha and omega, the beginning and the ending of our days, we now submit for Thy divine approval the work that has been accomplished in this session. Bless what we have done aright, pardon and overrule what we may have done amiss.

Grant now unto Thy servants home mercies and journeying mercies and a well-earned rest. Let Thy blessing be upon every Member of this body and all who minister to its comfort and efficiency—upon the officers and secretarial staff; upon the reporters who take down every word, for there is not a word in our tongue but lo they record it altogether; upon the doorkeepers, and the page boys who run to and fro at our beck and call; upon the members of the press, and the great cloud of witnesses who crowd the galleries from every quarter of the country.

Now lettest Thou Thy servants depart in peace. The Lord bless you, and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you, and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift up His countenance upon you, and give you peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 25, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MRS. MARTHA TRUMAN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, an hour or two ago the President of the United States left Washington for his home in Missouri to be at the bedside of his aged mother, who, as we all know, has been ill for several months. Word has just come that she has passed away. The President was unable to reach her bedside before the end came.

I am sure that I speak for all Senators and for all the people of the country when I say that we deeply mourn the loss of the President's mother and sympathize with him in his bereavement.

It is a rare thing for any American to live to be 94 years of age. It is a rarer thing for any American mother to live to see her son become President of the United States.

The President's mother was one of the finest characters in the history of the United States, one of the finest mothers, one of the most typical mothers it has ever been my good fortune to know anything about. She was plain, simple, honest, sympathetic, and deeply devoted to her family and her country. She lived to a riper old age than that referred to in the Bible—threescore years and ten—by some 24 years. She was totally unspoiled by the honors which came to her distinguished son, as he himself has been totally unspoiled by those honors. We all, I am sure, feel deeply the President's loss. We feel deeply the loss of so typical an American mother and American woman as was Mrs. Martha Truman. I express, in a prayerful mood, the hope that the end came peacefully, that her memory will always remain verdant among all who knew her or came under her influence, and that her example of simple Americanism, of Christian virtues, may be emulated by all of us who appreciate the value of American life.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not sure that there is any precedent for my suggestion, but, in response to the words of the minority leader, I should like to suggest that as the Senate's expression of sympathy the Senate send to the President a floral piece, if that suggestion meets with the approval of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think that is a very happy suggestion, and I join in the suggestion that a suitable floral piece be sent to Independence, Mo., representing the sympathy of Members of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

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 the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On July 25, 1947:

S. 254. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey;

S. 1262. An act to provide a central authority for standardizing geographic names for the purpose of eliminating duplication in standardizing such names among the Federal departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1497. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916; and

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to terminate certain emergency and war powers.

On July 26, 1947:

S. 323. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts;

S. 512. An act to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands; and

S. 753. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian irrigation project.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 272. An act to provide for the utilization of surplus War Department-owned real property as national cemeteries, when feasible; and

S. 1070. An act to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34 to the bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PLOESER, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. MAHON, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mr. GORE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1650. An act for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz;

H. R. 2029. An act to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap;

H. R. 2993. An act to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4068. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building