SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, March 29, 1948)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Hear, O God, our Father, the earnest supplications of the Senators gathered for this sacred moment of prayer and deepen our feelings of unity and fellowship as we pray with them and for them.

Give us wisdom to see that no good life comes without right discipline.

Give us the grace to impose it upon ourselves, lest others do it for us.

Help us to discipline our speech, that we may seek clarity rather than cleverness and sincerity instead of sarcasm.

Help us to discipline our thinking and our actions, that in this place the world may see democracy at its best and us at our best for democracy and for Thee to use us.

In the name of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 31, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of March 31, 1948.

The Secretary of the Senate received on March 31, 1948, the following message from the House of Representatives:

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 Senate to the bill (H. R. 5314) to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5314) to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. EATON, Mr. VORYS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BLOOM, and Mr. KEE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair) laid before the Senate the following amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world, together with a message from the House insisting upon its amendments and requesting a conference with the Senate thereon:

AMENDMENTS OF HOUSE

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That this act may be cited as the 'Foreign Assistance Act of 1948.'

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the 'Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.'

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 102. (a) Recognizing the intimate economic and other relationships between the United States and the nations of Europe, and recognizing that disruption following in the wake of war is not contained by national frontiers, the Congress finds that the existing situation in Europe endangers the establishment of a lasting peace, the general welfare and national interest of the United States, and the attainment of the objectives of the United Nations. The restoration or maintenance in European countries of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence rests largely upon the establishment of sound economic and political conditions, stable international economic and political relationships, and the achievement by the countries of Europe of a healthy economy independent of extraordinary outside assistance. The accomplishment of these objectives calls for a plan of European recovery, open to all such nations which cooperate in such plan, based upon a strong production effort, the expansion of foreign trade, the creation and maintenance of internal financial stability, and the development of economic cooperation, including all possible steps to establish and maintain equitable rates of exchange and to bring about the progressive elimination of trade barriers. Mindful of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to the countries of Europe, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries through a joint organization to exert sustained common efforts as set forth in the report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation signed at Paris on September 22, 1947, which will speedily achieve that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe through assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation: *Provided*, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States. It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that continuity of assistance provided by the United States should, at all times, be dependent upon continuity of cooperation among countries participating in the program.

"PURPOSES OF TITLE

"(b) It is the purpose of this title to effectuate the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section by furnishing material and financial assistance to the participating countries in such a manner as to aid them, through their own individual and concerted efforts, to become independent of extraordinary outside economic assistance within the period of operations under this title, by—

"(1) promoting industrial and agricultural production in the participating countries;

"(2) furthering the restoration or maintenance of the soundness of European currencies, budgets, and finances; and

"(3) facilitating and stimulating the growth of international trade of participating countries with one another and with other countries by appropriate measures including reduction of barriers which may hamper such trade.

"PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES

"SEC. 103. (a) As used in this title, the term 'participating country' means—

"(1) any country, together with dependent areas under its administration, which signed the report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation at Paris on September 22, 1947; and

"(2) any other country (including Spain, any of the zones of occupation of Germany, any area under international administration or control, and the Free Territory of Trieste or either of its zones) wholly or partly in Europe, together with dependent areas under its administration;

"provided such country adheres to, and for so long as it remains an adherent to, a joint program for European recovery designed to accomplish the purposes of this title.

"(b) Until such time as the Free Territory of Trieste or either of its zones becomes eligible for assistance under this title as a participating country, assistance to the Free Territory of Trieste, or either of its zones, is hereby authorized under the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 until June 30, 1949, and the said Foreign Aid Act of 1947 is hereby amended accordingly, and not to exceed $20,000,000 out of funds authorized to be advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under subsection (a) of section 114 of this title may be utilized for the purposes of this subsection: *Provided*, That section 11 (b) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 shall not apply in respect of the Free Territory of Trieste or either of its zones: *And provided further*, That the provisions of section 115 (b) (6) of this title shall apply to local currency deposited pursuant to section 5 (b) of that act.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 104. (a) There is hereby established, with its principal office in the District of Columbia, an agency of the Government which shall be known as the Economic Cooperation Administration, hereinafter referred to as the Administration. The Administration shall be headed by an Administrator for Economic Cooperation, hereinafter referred to as the Administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum. The Administrator shall be responsible to the President and shall have a status in the executive branch of the Government comparable to that of the head of an executive department. Except as otherwise provided in this title, the administration of the provisions of this title is hereby vested in the Administrator and his functions shall be performed under the control of the President.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

"(b) There shall be in the Administration a Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. The Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation shall perform such functions as the Administrator shall designate, and shall be Acting Administrator for Economic Cooperation during the absence or disability of the Administrator or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Administrator.

"(c) The President is authorized, pending the appointment and qualification of the first Administrator or Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation appointed hereunder, to provide, for a period of not to exceed 30 days after the date of enactment of this act, for the performance of the functions of the Administrator under this title through such departments, agencies, or establishments of the United States Government as he may direct. In the event the President nominates an Administrator or Deputy Administrator prior to the expiration of such 30-day period, the authority conferred upon the President by this subsection shall be extended beyond such 30-day period but only until an Administrator or Deputy Administrator qualifies and takes office.

"(d) (1) The Administrator, with the approval of the President, is hereby authorized and empowered to create a corporation with such powers as the Administrator may deem necessary or appropriate for the accomplishment of the purposes of this title.

"(2) If a corporation is created under this section—

"(i) it shall have the power to sue and be sued, to acquire, hold, and dispose of property, to use its revenues, to determine the character of and necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed and paid, and to exercise such other powers as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of the corporation;

"(ii) its powers shall be set out in a charter which shall be valid only when certified copies thereof are filed with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives and published in the Federal Register, and all amendments to such charter shall be valid only when similarly filed and published;

"(iii) it shall not have succession beyond June 30, 1952, except for purposes of liquidation, unless its life is extended beyond such date pursuant to act of Congress; and

"(iv) it shall be subject to the Government Corporation Control Act to the same extent as wholly owned Government corporations listed in section 101 of such act.

"(3) All capital stock of the corporation shall be of one class, be issued for cash only, and be subscribed for by the Administrator. Payment for such capital stock shall be made from funds available for the purposes of this title.

"(e) Any department, agency, or establishment of the Government (including, whenever used in this title, any corporation which is an instrumentality of the United States) performing functions under this title is authorized to employ, for duty within the continental limits of the United States, such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this title, and funds available pursuant to section 114 of this title shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 219). Of such personnel employed by the Administration, not to exceed 100 may be compensated without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of whom not more than 25 may be compensated at a rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, but not in excess of $15,000 per annum. Experts and consultants or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 55a), may be employed by the Administration, and individuals so employed may be compensated at rates not in excess of $50 per diem and while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be paid actual travel expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses while so employed.

"(f) The Administrator may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out his functions under this title, and he may delegate authority to perform any of such functions to his subordinates, acting under his direction and under rules and regulations promulgated by him.

"GENERAL FUNCTIONS OF ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 105. (a) The Administrator, under the control of the President, shall in addition to all other functions vested in him by this title—

"(1) review and appraise the requirements of participating countries for assistance under the terms of this title;

"(2) formulate programs of United States assistance under this title, including approval of specific projects which have been submitted to him by the participating countries;

"(3) provide for the efficient execution of any such programs as may be placed in operation; and

"(4) terminate provision of assistance or take other remedial action as provided in section 118 of this title.

"(b) In order to strengthen and make more effective the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States—

"(1) the Administrator and the Secretary of State shall keep each other fully and currently informed on matters, including prospective action, arising within the scope of their respective duties which are pertinent to the duties of the other;

"(2) whenever the Secretary of State believes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act on the part of the Administrator is inconsistent with the foreign-policy objectives of the United States, he shall consult with the Administrator and, if differences of review are not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the President for final decision;

"(3) whenever the Administrator believes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act on the part of the Secretary of State is inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of this title, he shall consult with the Secretary of State and, if differences of view are not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the President for final decision.

"(c) The Administrator and the department, agency, or officer in the executive branch of the Government exercising the authority granted to the President by section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, shall keep each other fully and currently informed on matters, including prospective action, arising within the scope of their respective duties which are pertinent to the duties of the other. Whenever the Administrator believes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act on the part of such department, agency, or officer in performing functions under this title is inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of this title, he shall consult with such department, agency, or officer and, if differences of view are not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the President for final decision.

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

"SEC. 106. Section 4 (a) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (59 Stat. 512, 513) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 4. (a) In order to coordinate the policies and operations of the representatives of the United States on the Fund and the Bank and of all agencies of the Government which make or participate in making foreign loans or which engage in foreign financial, exchange or monetary transactions, there is hereby established the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"), consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, as Chairman, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and during such period as the Economic Cooperation Administration shall continue to exist, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation.'

"PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 107. (a) There is hereby created a Public Advisory Board, hereinafter referred to as the Board, which shall advise and consult with the Administrator with respect to general or basic policy matters arising in connection with the Administrator's discharge of his responsibilities. The Board shall consist of the Administrator, who shall be Chairman, and not to exceed 12 additional members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be selected from among citizens of the United States of broad and varied experience in business, labor, agriculture, the professions, and in matters affecting the public interest, other than officers and employees of the United States (including any agency or instrumentality of the United States) who, as such, regularly receive compensation for current services. The Board shall meet at least one a month and at other times upon the call of the Administrator or when three or more members of the Board request the Administrator to call a meeting. Not more than a majority of two of the members shall be appointed to the Board from the same political party. Members of the Board, other than the Administrator, shall receive, out of funds made available for the purposes of this title, a per diem allowance of $50 for each day spent away from their homes or regular places of business, for the purpose of attendance at meetings of the Board, or at conferences held upon the call of the Administrator, and in necessary travel, and while so engaged, they may be paid actual travel expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

"(b) The Administrator may appoint such other advisory committees as he may determine to be necessary or desirable to effectuate the purposes of this title.

"UNITED STATES SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE ABROAD

"SEC. 108. There shall be a United States Special Representative in Europe who shall (a) be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (b) be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 1, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), and (c) have the rank of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary. He shall be the representative of the Administrator, and shall also be the chief representative of the United States Government to any organization of participating countries which may be established by such countries to further a joint program for European recovery, and shall discharge in Europe such additional responsibilities as may be assigned to him with the approval of the President in furtherance of the purposes of this title. He may also be designated as the United States representative on the Economic Commission for Europe. He shall receive his instructions from the Administrator and such instructions shall be prepared and transmitted to him in accordance with procedures agreed

to between the Administrator and the Secretary of State in order to assure appropriate coordination as provided by subsection (b) of section 105 of this title. He shall coordinate the activities of the chiefs of special missions provided for in section 109 of this title. He shall keep the Administrator, the Secretary of State, the chiefs of the United States diplomatic missions, the chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the House Appropriations Committee, and the chiefs of the special missions provided for in section 109 of this title currently informed concerning his activities. He shall consult with the chiefs of all such missions, who shall give him such cooperation as he may require for the performance of his duties under this title.

"SPECIAL ECA MISSIONS ABROAD

"SEC. 109. (a) There shall be established for each participating country, except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, a special mission for economic cooperation under the direction of a chief who shall be responsible for assuring the performance within such country of operations under this title. The chief shall be appointed by the Administrator, shall receive his instructions from the Administrator, and shall report to the Administrator on the performance of the duties assigned to him. The chief of the special mission shall take rank immediately after the chief of the United States diplomatic mission in such country.

"(b) The chief of the special mission shall keep the chief of the United States diplomatic mission fully and currently informed on matters, including prospective action, arising within the scope of the operations of the special mission and the chief of the diplomatic mission shall keep the chief of the special mission fully and currently informed on matters relative to the conduct of the duties of the chief of the special mission. The chief of the United States diplomatic mission will be responsible for assuring that the operations of the special mission are consistent with the foreign-policy objectives of the United States in such country and to that end whenever the chief of the United States diplomatic mission believes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act on the part of the special mission is inconsistent with such foreign-policy objectives, he shall so advise the chief of the special mission and the United States Special Representative in Europe. If differences of view are not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the Secretary of State and the Administrator for decision.

"(c) The Secretary of State shall provide such office space, facilities, and other administrative services for the United States Special Representative in Europe and his staff, and for the special mission in each participating country, as may be agreed between the Secretary of State and the Administrator.

"(d) With respect to any of the zones of occupation of Germany and of the Free Territory of Trieste, during the period of occupation, the President shall make appropriate administrative arrangements for the conduct of operations under this title, in order to enable the Administrator to carry out his responsibility to assure the accomplishment of the purposes of this title.

"PERSONNEL OUTSIDE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 110. (a) For the purpose of performing functions under this title outside the continental limits of the United States, the Administrator may—

"(1) employ persons who shall receive compensation at any of the rates provided for the Foreign Service Reserve and Staff by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), together with allowances and benefits established thereunder; and

"(2) recommend the appointment or assignment of persons, and the Secretary of State may appoint or assign such persons, to any class in the Foreign Service Reserve or Staff for the duration of operations under this title, and the Secretary of State may assign, transfer, or promote such persons upon the recommendation of the Administrator. Persons so appointed to the Foreign Service Staff shall be entitled to the benefits of section 528 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

"(b) For the purpose of performing functions under this title outside the continental limits of the United States, the Secretary of State may, at the request of the Administrator, appoint, for the duration of operations under this title, alien clerks and employees in accordance with applicable provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999).

"(c) No citizen or resident of the United States may be employed, or if already employed, may be assigned to duties by the Secretary of State or the Administrator under this title for a period to exceed 3 months unless such individual has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State and the Administrator, or until the Secretary of State or the Administrator has certified in writing (and filed copies thereof with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs) that, on the basis of such report, he believes such individual is of unquestioned loyalty to the United States, its Constitution, laws, and form of government, and is not now and has never been a member of any organization advocating contrary views: *Provided, however*, That any present employee of the Government, pending the report as to such employee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may be temporarily assigned to duties under this title for the period of 3 months from the date of its enactment. This subsection shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"NATURE AND METHOD OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 111. (a) The Administrator may, from time to time, furnish assistance to any participating country by providing for the performance of any of the functions set forth in paragraphs (1) through (6) of this subsection when he deems it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this title, and upon the terms and conditions set forth in this title and such additional terms and conditions consistent with the provisions of this title as he may determine to be necessary and proper.

"(1) Procurement from any source, including Government stocks on the same basis as procurement by Government agencies under Public Law 375 (79th Cong.) for their own use, of any commodity which he determines to be required for the furtherance of the purposes of this title. As used in this title, the term 'commodity' means any commodity, material, article, supply, or goods necessary for the purposes of this title.

"(2) Processing, storing, transporting, and repairing any commodities, or performing any other services with respect to a participating country which he determines to be required for accomplishing the purposes of this title. The Administrator shall, in providing for the procurement of commodities under authority of this title, take such steps as may be necessary to assure, so far as is practicable, that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities, procured within United States out of funds made available under this title and transported abroad on ocean vessels, is so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates.

"(3) Procurement of and furnishing technical information and assistance.

"(4) Transfer of any commodity or service, which transfer shall be signified by delivery of the custody and right of possession and use of such commodity, or otherwise making available any such commodity, or by rendering a service to a participating country or to any agency or organization representing a participating country.

"(5) The allocation of commodities or services to specific projects designed to carry out the purposes of this title, which have been submitted to the Administrator by participating countries and have been approved by him.

"(b) In order to facilitate and maximize the use of private channels of trade, subject to adequate safeguards to assure that all expenditures in connection with such procurement are within approved programs in accordance with terms and conditions established by the Administrator, he may provide for the performance of any of the functions described in subsection (a) of this section—

"(1) by establishing accounts against which, under regulations prescribed by the Administrator—

"(i) letters of commitment may be issued in connection with supply programs approved by the Administrator (and such letters of commitment, when issued, shall constitute obligations of the United States and moneys due or to become due under the contracts to which they relate shall be assignable under the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and shall constitute obligations of applicable appropriations);

"(ii) withdrawals may be made by participating countries, or agencies or organizations representing participating countries, or by other persons or organizations, upon presentation of contracts, invoices, or other documentation specified by the Administrator under arrangements prescribed by the Administrator to assure the use of such withdrawals for purposes approved by the Administrator.

Such accounts may be established on the books of the Administration, or any other department, agency, or establishment of the Government specified by the Administrator, or, on terms and conditions approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, in banking institutions in the United States. Expenditures of funds which have been made available through accounts so established shall be accounted for on standard documentation required for expenditures of Government funds: *Provided*, That such expenditures for commodities or services procured outside the continental limits of the United States under authority of this section may be accounted for exclusively on such certification as the Administrator may prescribe in regulations promulgated by him with the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States to assure expenditure in furtherance of the purposes of this title.

"(2) by utilizing the services and facilities of any department, agency, or establishment of the Government as the President shall direct, or with the consent of the head of such department, agency, or establishment, or, in the President's discretion by acting in cooperation with the United Nations or with other international organizations or with agencies of the participating countries, and funds allocated pursuant to this section to any department, agency, or establishment of the Government shall be established in separate appropriation accounts on the books of the Treasury.

"(3) by making, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator, guaranties to any person of investments in connection with projects approved by the Administrator and the participating country concerned as furthering the purposes of this title (including guaranties of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media: *Provided*, That the

amount of such guaranties in the first year after the date of the enactment of this act does not exceed $15,000,000), which guaranties shall terminate not later than 14 years from the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That—

"(i) the guaranty to any person shall not exceed the amount of dollars invested in the project by such person with the approval of the Administrator and shall be limited to the transfer into United States dollars of other currencies, or credits in such currencies, received by such person as income from the approved investment, as repayment or return thereof, in whole or in part, or as compensation for the sale or disposition of all or any part thereof: *Provided*, That, when any payment is made to any person under authority of this paragraph, such currencies, or credits in such currencies, shall become the property of the United States Government;

"(ii) the Administrator may charge a fee in an amount determined by him not exceeding 1 percent per annum of the amount of each guaranty, and all fees collected hereunder shall be available for expenditure in discharge of liabilities under guaranties made under this paragraph until such time as all such liabilities have been discharged or have expired, or until all such fees have been expended in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph.

"(iii) as used in this paragraph, the term 'person' means a citizen of the United States or any corporation, partnership, or other association created under the laws of the United States or of any State or Territory and substantially beneficially owned by citizens of the United States.

The total amount of the guaranties made under this paragraph (3) shall not exceed $500,000,000, and as such guaranties are made the authority to realize funds from the sale of notes for the purpose of allocating funds to the Export-Import Bank of Washington under paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of this section shall be accordingly reduced. Any payments made to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under paragraph (3) of this subsection shall be paid out of fees collected under subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (3) of this subsection as long as such fees are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds realized from the sale of notes issued under authority of paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of this section, which funds shall be obligated for this purpose at the time each such guaranty is made.

"(c) (1) The Administrator may provide assistance for any participating country, in the form and under the procedures authorized in subsections (a) and (b), respectively, of this section, through grants or upon payment in cash, or on credit terms, or on such other terms of payment as he may find appropriate, including payment by the transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator and the participating country) of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources. In determining whether such assistance shall be through grants or upon terms of payment, and in determining the terms of payment, he shall act in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, and the determination whether or not a participating country should be required to make payment for any assistance furnished to such country in furtherance of the purposes of this title, and the terms of such payment, if required, shall depend upon the character and purpose of the assistance and upon whether there is reasonable assurance of repayment considering the capacity of such country to make such payments without jeopardizing the accomplishment of the purposes of this title.

"(2) When it is determined that assistance should be extended under the provisions of this title on credit terms, the Administrator shall allocate funds for the purpose to the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which shall, notwithstanding the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 526), as amended, make and administer the credit on terms specified by the Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this paragraph during the period of 1 year following the date of enactment of this act, and for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of this section the Administrator is authorized to issue notes from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate $1,000,000,000. Such notes shall bear such rate of interest as may be determined by the Administrator with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to purchase any notes issued hereunder, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are hereby extended to include such purpose. Payment under this paragraph of the purchase price of such notes shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. In allocating funds to the Export-Import Bank of Washington under this paragraph, the Administrator shall first utilize such funds realized from the sale of notes authorized by this paragraph as he determines to be available for this purpose, and when such funds are exhausted, or after the end of 1 year from the date of enactment of this act, whichever is earlier, he shall utilize any funds appropriated under this title. The Administrator shall make advances to, or reimburse, the Export-Import Bank of Washington for necessary administrative expenses in connection with such credits. Credits made by the Export-Import Bank of Washington with funds so allocated to it by the Administrator shall not be considered in determining whether the bank has outstanding at any one time loans and guaranties to the extent of the limitation imposed by section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 529), as amended. Amounts received in repayment of principal and interest on any credits made under this paragraph shall be deposited into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury: *Provided*, That, to the extent required for such purpose, amounts received in repayment of principal and interest on any credits made out of funds realized from the sale of notes authorized under this paragraph shall be deposited into the Treasury for the purpose of the retirement of such notes.

"PROTECTION OF DOMESTEC ECONOMY

"SEC. 112. (a) The Administrator shall provide for the procurement in the United States of commodities under this title in such a way as to (1) minimize the drain upon the resources of the United States and the impact of such procurement upon the domestic economy, and (2) avoid impairing the fulfillment of vital needs of the people of the United States.

"(b) The procurement of petroleum and petroleum products under this title shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be made from petroleum sources outside the United States; and, in furnishing commodities under the provisions of this title, the Administrator shall take fully into account the present and anticipated world shortage of petroleum and its products and the consequent undesirability of expansion in petroleum-consuming equipment where the use of alternate fuels or other sources of power is practicable.

"(c) In order to assure the conservation of domestic grain supplies and the retention in the United States of byproduct feeds necessary to the maintenance of the agricultural economy of the United States, the amounts of wheat and wheat flour produced in the United States to be transferred by grant to the participating countries shall be so determined that the total quantity of United States wheat used to produce the wheat flour procured in the United States for transfer by grant to such countries under this title shall not be less than 25 percent of the aggregate of the unprocessed wheat and wheat in the form of flour procured in the United States for transfer by grant to such countries under this title. The amounts of corn and derivatives except intoxicating liquors of corn produced in the United States to be transferred by grant to the participating countries shall be so determined that the total quantity of United States corn used to produce the derivatives except intoxicating liquors procured in the United States for transfer by grant to such countries under this title shall not be less than 50 percent of the aggregate of the unprocessed corn and corn derivatives except intoxicating liquors procured in the United States for transfer by grant to such countries under this title.

"(d) The term 'surplus agricultural commodity' as used in this section is defined as any agricultural commodity, or product thereof, canned foods produced in the United States which is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of domestic requirements. For the purposes of this act such term shall include any domestically produced fishery product (whether fish, shellfish, mollusk, or crustaceous) which is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of domestic requirements. In providing for the procurement of any such surplus agricultural commodity for transfer by grant to any participating country in accordance with the requirements of such country, the Administrator shall, insofar as practicable and where in furtherance of the purposes of this title, give effect to the following:

"(1) The Administrator shall authorize the procurement of any such surplus agricultural commodity only within the United States: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not be applicable (i) to any agricultural commodity, or product thereof, located in one participating country, and intended for transfer to another participating country, if the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, determines that such procurement and transfer is in furtherance of the purposes of this title, and would not create a burdensome surplus in the United States or seriously prejudice the position of domestic producers of such surplus agricultural commodities, or (ii) if, and to the extent that any such surplus agricultural commodity is not available in the United States in sufficient quantities to supply the requirements of the participating countries under this title.

"(2) In providing for the procurement of any such surplus agricultural commodity, the Administrator shall, insofar as practicable and applicable, and after giving due consideration to the excess of any such commodity over domestic requirements, and to the historic reliance of United States producers of any such surplus agricultural commodity upon markets in the participating countries, provide for the procurement of each class or type of any such surplus agricultural commodity in the approximate proportion that the Secretary of Agriculture determines such classes or types bear to the total amount of excess of such surplus agricultural commodity over domestic requirements.

"(e) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that any quantity of any surplus agricultural commodity, heretofore or hereafter acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation in the administration of its price-support programs, is available for use

in furnishing assistance to foreign countries, he shall so advise all departments, agencies, and establishments of the Government administering laws providing for the furnishing of assistance or relief to foreign countries (including occupied or liberated countries or areas of such countries). Thereafter the department, agency, or establishment administering any such law shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of such law, and where for transfer by grant and in accordance with the requirements of such foreign country, procure or provide for the procurement of such quantity of such surplus agricultural commodity. The sales price paid as reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for any such surplus agricultural commodity shall be in such amount as Commodity Credit Corporation determines will fully reimburse it for the cost to it of such surplus agricultural commodity at the time and place such surplus agricultural commodity is delivered by it, but in no event shall the sales price be higher than the domestic market price at such time and place of delivery as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Agriculture may pay not to exceed 50 percent of such sales price as authorized by subsection (f) of this section."

"(f) Subject to the provisions of this section, but notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to encourage utilization of surplus agricultural commodities pursuant to this or any other act providing for assistance or relief to foreign countries, the Secretary of Agriculture, in carrying out the purposes of clause (1), section 32, Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, may make payments, including payments to any Government agency procuring or selling such surplus agricultural commodities, in an amount not to exceed 50 percent of the sales price (basis free along ship or free on board vessel, United States ports), as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, of such surplus agricultural commodities. The rescission of the remainder of section 32 funds by the act of July 30, 1947 (Public Law 266, 80th Cong.), is hereby canceled and such funds are hereby made available for the purposes of section 32 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

"(g) No export shall be authorized pursuant to authority conferred by section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), including any amendment thereto, of any commodity from the United States to any country wholly or partly in Europe which is not a participating country, if the Secretary of Commerce determines that the supply of such commodity is insufficient (or would be insufficient if such export were permitted) to fulfill the requirements of participating countries under this title as determined by the Administrator: *Provided, however,* That such export may be authorized if the Secretary of Commerce determines that such export is otherwise in the national interest of the United States: *Provided further,* That the Administrator is directed to refuse delivery insofar as practicable to participating countries of commodities or products which go into the production of any commodity for delivery to any nonparticipating European country which commodities or products would be refused export licenses to those countries by the United States in the interest of its national security. Whenever the Administrator determines that it is in the national interest of the United States to prohibit the exporation of any commodity to any country wholly or partly in Europe which is not a participating country, the department, agency, or officer in the executive branch of the Government exercising the authority granted to the President by section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, shall take such action as may be necessary to prohibit the exportation of such commodity to such country.

"(h) In providing for the performance of any of the functions described in subsection (a) of section 111, the Administrator shall, to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this title, utilize private channels of trade.

"REIMBURSEMENT TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

"SEC. 113. (a) The Administrator shall make reimbursement or payment, out of funds available for the purposes of this title, for any commodity, service, or facility procured under section 111 of this title from any department, agency, or establishment of the Government. Such reimbursement or payment shall be made to the owning or disposal agency, as the case may be, at replacement cost, or, if required by law, at actual cost, or at any other price authorized by law and agreed to between the Administrator and such agency. The amount of any reimbursement or payment to an owning agency for commodities, services, or facilities so procured shall be credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which there may be procured replacements of similar commodities or such services or facilities: *Provided,* That such commodities, services, or facilities may be procured from an owning agency only with the consent of such agency: *And provided further,* That where such appropriations, funds, or accounts are not reimbursable except by reason of this subsection, and when the owning agency determines that replacement of any commodity procured under authority of this section is not necessary, any funds received in payment therefor shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(b) The Administrator, whenever in his judgment the interests of the United States will best be served thereby, may dispose of any commodity procured out of funds made available for the purposes of this title, in lieu of transferring such commodity to a participating country, (1) by transfer of such commodity, upon reimbursement, to any department, agency, or establishment of the Government for use or disposal by such department, agency, or establishment as authorized by law, or (2) without regard to provisions of law relating to the disposal of Government-owned property, when necessary to prevent spoilage or wastage of such commodity or to conserve the usefulness thereof. Funds realized from such disposal or transfer shall revert to the respective appropriation or appropriations out of which funds were expended for the procurement of such commodity.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 114. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $1,000,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this title, in such manner, at such time, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest, for advances made by it hereunder, from funds made available for the purposes of this title.

"(b) Such part as the President may determine of the unobligated and unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds available for the purposes of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 shall be available for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(c) In order to carry out the provisions of this title with respect to those participating countries which adhere to the purposes of this title, and remain eligible to receive assistance hereunder, such funds shall be available as are hereafter authorized and appropriated to the President from time to time through June 30, 1952, to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this title: *Provided, however,* That for carrying out the provisions and accomplishing the purposes of this title for the period of 1 year following the date of enactment of this act, there are hereby authorized to be so appropriated not to exceed $4,300,000,000. Nothing in this title is intended nor shall it be construed as an express or implied commitment to provide any specific assistance, whether of funds, commodities, or services, to any country or countries. The authorization in this title is limited to the period of 12 months in order that subsequent Congresses may pass on any subsequent authorizations.

"(d) Funds made available for the purposes of this title shall be available for incurring and defraying all necessary expenses incident to carrying out the provisions of this title, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation, allowances, and travel of personnel, including Foreign Service personnel whose services are utilized primarily for the purposes of this title, and, without regard to the provisions of any other law, for printing and binding, and for expenditures outside the continental limits of the United States for the procurement of supplies and services and for other administrative purposes (other than compensation of personnel) without regard to such laws and regulations governing the obligation and expenditure of Government funds, as the Administrator shall specify in the interest of the accomplishment of the purposes of this title.

"(e) The unexpended portions of any deposits which may have been made by any participating country pursuant to section 6 of the joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and section 5 (b) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.) may be merged with the deposits to be made by such participating country in accordance with section 115 (b) (6) of this title, and shall be held or used under the same terms and conditions as are provided in section 115 (b) (6) of this title.

"(f) In order to reserve some part of the surplus of the fiscal year 1948 for payments thereafter to be made under this title, there is hereby created on the books of the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the Foreign Economic Cooperation Trust Fund. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an amount of $3,000,000,000, out of sums appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in this title shall, when appropriated, be transferred immediately to the trust fund, and shall thereupon be considered as expended during the fiscal year 1948, for the purpose of reporting governmental expenditures. The Secretary of the Treasury shall be the sole trustee of the trust fund and is authorized and directed to pay out of the fund such amounts as the Administrator shall duly requisition. The first expenditures made out of the appropriations authorized under this title in the fiscal year 1949 shall be made with funds requisitioned by the Administrator out of the trust fund until the fund is exhausted, at which time such fund shall cease to exist. The provisions of this subsection shall not be construed as affecting the application of any provisions of law which would otherwise govern the obligation of funds so appropriated or the auditing or submission of accounts of transactions with respect to such funds.

"BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL UNDERTAKINGS

"SEC. 115. (a) The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Administrator, is authorized to conclude, with individual participating countries or any number of such countries or with an organization representing any such countries, agreements in furtherance of the purposes of this title. The Secretary of State, before an Administrator

or Deputy Administrator shall have qualified and taken office, is authorized to negotiate and conclude such temporary agreements in implementation of subsection (b) of this section as he may deem necessary in furtherance of the purposes of this title: *Provided*, That when an Administrator or Deputy Administrator shall have qualified and taken office, the Secretary of State shall conclude the basic agreements required by subsection (b) of this section only after consultation with the Administrator or Deputy Administrator, as the case may be.

"(b) The provision of assistance under this title results from the multilateral pledges of the participating countries to use all their efforts to accomplish a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation as embodied in the report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation signed at Paris on September 22, 1947, and is contingent upon continuous effort of the participating countries to accomplish a joint recovery program through multilateral undertakings and the establishment of a continuing organization for this purpose. In addition to continued mutual cooperation of the participating countries in such a program, each such country shall conclude an agreement with the United States in order for such country to be eligible to receive assistance under this title. Such agreement shall provide for the adherence of such country to the purposes of this title and shall, where applicable, make appropriate provision, among others, for—

"(1) promoting industrial and agricultural production in order to enable the participating country to become independent of extraordinary outside economic assistance; and submitting for the approval of the Administrator, upon his request and whenever he deems it in furtherance of the purposes of this title, specific projects proposed by such country to be undertaken in substantial part with assistance furnished under this title, which projects, whenever practicable, shall include projects for increased production of coal, steel, transportation facilities, and food;

"(2) taking financial and monetary measures necessary to stabilize its currency, establish or maintain a valid rate of exchange, to balance its governmental budget as soon as practicable, and generally to restore or maintain confidence in its monetary system;

"(3) cooperating with other participating countries in facilitating and stimulating an increasing interchange of goods and services among the participating countries and with other countries and cooperating to reduce barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries, and in removing progressively the obstacles to the free movement of persons within Europe among the participating countries;

"(4) making efficient and practical use, within the framework of a joint program for European recovery, of the resources of such participating country, including any commodities, facilities, or services furnished under this title, which use shall include, to the extent practicable, taking measures to locate and identify and put into active use, in furtherance of such program, assets, and earnings therefrom, which belong to the citizens of such country and which are situated within the United States, its Territories and possessions;

"(5) facilitating the transfer to the United States by sale, exchange, barter, or otherwise for stock-piling or other purposes, for such period of time as may be agreed to and upon reasonable terms and in reasonable quantities, of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources, and which may be available in such participating country after due regard for reasonable requirements for domestic use and commercial export of such country;

"(6) placing in a special account a deposit in the currency of such country, in commensurate amounts and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed to between such country and the Government of the United States, when any commodity or service is made available through any means authorized under this title, and is furnished to the participating country on a grant basis. Such special account, together with the unexpended portions of any deposits which may have been made by such country pursuant to section 6 of the joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and section 5 (b) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.), shall be held as used within such country for such purposes as may be agreed to between such country and the Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, and the Public Advisory Board provided for in section 107 (a) for purposes of internal monetary and financial stabilization, for the stimulation of productive activity and the exploration for and development of new sources of wealth, or for such other expenditures as may be consistent with the purposes of this title, including local currency administrative expenditures of the United States incident to operations under this title, and under agreement that any unencumbered balance remaining in such account on June 30, 1952, shall be disposed of within such country for such purposes as may, subject to approval by act or joint resolution of the Congress, be agreed to between such country and the Government of the United States;

"(7) publishing in such country and transmitting to the United States, not less frequently than every calendar quarter after the date of the agreement, full statements of operations under the agreement, including a report of the use of funds, commodities, and services received under this title;

"(8) furnishing promptly, upon request of the United States, any relevant information which would be of assistance to the United States in determining the nature and scope of operations and the use of assistance provided under this title;

"(9) recognizing the principle of equity in respect to the drain upon the natural resources of the United States and of the recipient countries, by (a) providing for a future schedule of minimum availabilities to the United States for future purchase and delivery of a fair share of strategic materials at world market prices so as to protect the access of United States industry to an equitable share of such materials either in percentages of production or in absolute quantities from the territories and possessions of the participating countries, and (b) agreeing to negotiate suitable protection for the right of access for United States enterprise as defined in paragraph (iii) of subparagraph (3) of section 111 (b) in the development of such materials on terms of treatment equivalent to those afforded to the nationals of the country concerned, and (c) providing an agreed schedule of increased production of such materials where practicable in the territories or possessions of such participating countries and for delivery of an agreed percentage of such increased production in repayment on a long-term basis of grants or loans made by the Administrator to such countries;

"(10) submitting for the decision of the International Court of Justice or of any arbitral tribunal mutually agreed upon any case espoused by the United States Government involving compensation of a national of the United States for governmental measures affecting his property rights, including contracts with or concessions from such country.

"(c) Nothwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the Administrator, during the 3 months after the date of enactment of this act, may perform with respect to any participating country any of the functions authorized under this title which he may determine to be essential in furtherance of the purposes of this title, if (1) such country has signified its adherence to the purposes of this title and its intention to conclude an agreement pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and (2) he finds that such country is complying with the applicable provisions of subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, the Administrator may, through June 30, 1948, provide for the transfer of food, medical supplies, fibers, fuel, petroleum, and petroleum products, fertilizer, pesticides, and seed to any country of Europe which participated in the Committee of European Economic Cooperation and which undertook pledges to the other participants therein, when the Administrator determines that the transfer of any such supplies to any such country is essential in order to make it possible to carry out the purposes of this title by alleviating conditions of hunger and cold and by preventing serious economic retrogression.

"(d) The Administrator shall encourage the joint organization of the participating countries referred to in subsection (b) of this section to insure that each participating country makes efficient use of the resources of such country, including any commodities, facilities, or services furnished under this title, by observing and reviewing such use through an effective follow-up system approved by the joint organization.

"(e) The Administrator shall encourage arrangements among the participating countries looking toward the largest practicable utilization of manpower available in any of the participating countries in furtherance of the accomplishment of the purposes of this title. Such utilization of manpower shall include integration into the various recovery programs of the participating countries of a fair share of displaced persons who are the responsibility of the International Refugee Organization, under reasonable terms to be established in cooperation with that organization, in number and under conditions negotiated by the Administrator with the respective participating countries. The Administrator will request the Secretary of State to obtain the agreement of those countries concerned that such capital equipment as is scheduled for removal as reparations from the three western zones of Germany be retained in Germany if such retention will most effectively serve the purposes of the European recovery program.

"(f) It is the understanding of the Congress that, in accordance with agreements now in effect, prisoners of war remaining in participating countries shall, if they so freely elect, be repatriated prior to January 1, 1949.

"WESTERN HEMISPHERE COUNTRIES

"SEC. 116. The President shall take appropriate steps to encourage all countries in the Western Hemisphere to make available to participating countries such assistance as they may be able to furnish.

"OTHER DUTIES OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 117. (a) The Administrator, in furtherance of the purposes of section 115 (b) (5), and in agreement with a participating country, shall, whenever practicable, promote, by means of funds made available for the purposes of this title, an increase in the production in such participating country of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in the resources within the United States.

"(b) The Administrator, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall facilitate and encourage, through private and

public travel, transport, and other agencies, the promotion and development of travel by citizens of the United States to and within participating countries.

"(c) In order to further the efficient use of United States voluntary contributions for relief in participating countries receiving assistance under this title in the form of grants or any of the zones of occupation of Germany for which assistance is provided under this title and the Free Territory of Trieste or either of its zones, funds made available for the purposes of this title shall be used by the Administrator, under rules and regulations prescribed by him, to pay port charges in the United States, including handling costs from the post office at the port terminal to ship side and ocean freight charges from a United States port to a designated foreign port of entry (1) of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid for operations in Europe, or (2) of relief packages conforming to such specified size, weight, and contents, as the Administrator may prescribe originating in the United States and consigned to an individual residing in a participating country receiving assistance under this title in the form of grants or any of the zones of occupation of Germany for which assistance is provided under this title and the Free Territory of Trieste or either of its zones where practicable. The Administrator is authorized and directed to make an agreement with such country for the use of a portion of the deposit of local currency placed in a special account pursuant to paragraph (6) of subsection (b) of section 115 of this title, for the purpose of defraying the transportation cost of such supplies and relief packages from the port of entry of such country to the designated shipping point of consignee. The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Administrator, shall make agreements where practicable with the participating countries for the free entry of such supplies and relief packages. The execution of such agreements by the participating countries shall be a condition precedent to the receipt of assistance under this title. The Administrator is authorized in his discretion to reimburse United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies which are registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid for operations in Europe and which deliver relief packages from stock piles abroad, in the amount, or any portion of the amount, of the expense of furnishing the delivery service for such packages to stock piles abroad, and the Administrator may make an agreement with any participating country in which the voluntary relief agencies above described function for the use of a portion of the local currency deposit above described, for the purpose of defraying the cost of furnishing the delivery service for such relief packages from the port of entry in such country to the place of storage therein, and to the designated shipping point of the consignee therein.

"TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 118. The Administrator, in determining the form and measure of assistance provided under this title to any participating country, shall take into account the extent to which such country is complying with its undertakings embodied in its pledges to other participating countries and in its agreement concluded with the United States under section 115. The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title to any participating country whenever he determines that (1) such country is not adhering to its agreement concluded under section 115, or is diverting from the purposes of this title assistance provided hereunder, and that in the circumstances remedial action other than termination will not more effectively promote the purposes of this title or (2) because of changed conditions, assistance is no longer consistent with the national interest of the United States. Termination of assistance to any country under this section shall include the termination of deliveries of all supplies scheduled under the aid program for such country and not yet delivered.

"EXEMPTION FROM CONTRACT AND ACCOUNTING LAWS

"SEC. 119. When the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this title, the functions authorized under this title may be performed without regard to such provisions of law regulating the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts and the expenditure of Government funds as the President may specify.

"EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS RELATING TO EMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 120. Service of an individual as a member of the Public Advisory Board (other than the Administrator) created by section 107 (a), as a member of an advisory committee appointed pursuant to section 107 (b), as an expert or consultant under section 104 (e), shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), of section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99), or of section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

"UNITED NATIONS

"SEC. 121. (a) The President is authorized to request the cooperation of or the use of the services and facilities of the United Nations, its organs and specialized agencies, or other international organizations, in carrying out the purposes of this title, and may make payments, by advancements or reimbursements, for such purpose, out of funds made available for the purposes of this title, as may be necessary therefor, to the extent that special compensation is usually required for such services and facilities. Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize the Administrator to delegate to or otherwise confer upon any international or foreign organization or agency any of his authority to decide the method of furnishing assistance under this title to any participating country or the amount thereof.

"(b) The President shall cause to be transmitted to the Secretary General of the United Nations copies of reports to Congress on the operations conducted under this title.

"(c) Any agreements concluded between the United States and participating countries, or groups of such countries, in implementation of the purposes of this title, shall be registered with the United Nations if such registration is required by the Charter of the United Nations.

"TERMINATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 122. (a) After June 30, 1952, or after the date of the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress before such date, which declares that the powers conferred on the Administrator by or pursuant to subsection (a) of section 111 of this title are no longer necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of this title, whichever shall first occur, none of the functions authorized under such provisions may be exercised; except that during the twelve months following such date commodities and services with respect to which the Administrator had, prior to such date, authorized procurement for, shipment to, or delivery in a participating country, may be transferred to such country, and funds appropriated under authority of this title may be obligated during such twelve-month period for the necessary expenses of procurement, shipment, delivery, and other activities essential to such transfer, and shall remain available during such period for the necessary expenses of liquidating operations under this title.

"(b) At such time as the President shall find appropriate after such date, and prior to the expiration of the twelve months following such date, the powers, duties, and authority of the Administrator under this title may be transferred to such other departments, agencies, or establishments of the Government as the President shall specify, and the relevant funds, records, and personnel of the Administration may be transferred to the departments, agencies, or establishments to which the related functions are transferred.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 123. The President from time to time, but not less frequently than once every calendar quarter through June 30, 1952, and once every year thereafter until all operations under this title have been completed, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this title, including the text of bilateral and multilateral agreements entered into in carrying out the provisions of this title. Reports provided for under this section shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, if the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session.

"SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

"SEC. 124. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any circumstances or persons shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances or persons shall not be affected thereby.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'International Children's Emergency Fund Assistance Act of 1948.'

"SEC. 202. It is the purpose of this title to provide for the special care and feeding of children by authorizing additional moneys for the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations.

"SEC. 203. The President is hereby authorized and directed any time after the date of the enactment of this act and before July 1, 1949, to make contributions (a) from sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of this title and (b) from funds made available pursuant to the proviso in the first paragraph of the first section of the joint resolution of May 31, 1947 (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.), as amended, to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations for the special care and feeding of children.

"SEC. 204. No contribution shall be made pursuant to this title or such joint resolution of May 31, 1947, which would cause the sum of (a) the aggregate amount contributed pursuant to this title and (b) the aggregate amount contributed by the United States pursuant to such joint resolution of May 31, 1947, to exceed whichever of the following sums is the lesser:

"(1) 50 percent of the total resources contributed after May 31, 1947, by all governments for programs carried out under the supervision of such fund; or

"(2) One hundred million dollars.

"SEC. 205. No contribution shall be made pursuant to this title or such joint resolution of May 31, 1947, unless, at the time of such contribution, governments other than the United States Government have provided for use in the world program for the special care and feeding of children under the supervision of the fund at least 20 per-

cent of the total resources contributed by governments for such use after May 31, 1947.

"SEC. 206. Funds made available pursuant to such joint resolution of May 31, 1947, shall remain available through June 30, 1949.

"SEC. 207. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the sum of $60,000,000.

"TITLE III

"SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the 'Greek-Turkish-Chinese Assistance Act of 1948.'

"SEC. 302. Paragraph (2) of section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey' (61 Stat. 103), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(2) by detailing to the United States missions to Greece or Turkey or China under this act, or to the Governments of those countries in implementation of the purposes of this act, any persons in the employ of the Government of the United States; and while so detailed, any such persons shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his rights and privileges as such, as an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the department or agency from which detailed. Traveling expenses of such personnel to and from the place of detail shall be paid by the Government of the United States. Such personnel, and personnel detailed pursuant to paragraph (3) of this section, may receive such station allowances or additional allowances as the President may prescribe; and payments of such allowances heretofore made are hereby validated. No citizen or resident of the United States may be employed, or if already employed, may be assigned to duties by the Secretary of State under this act until such individual has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State: *Provided, however*, That any present employee of the Government, pending the report as to such employee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may be temporarily assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of the enactment of the Greek-Turkish-Chinese Assistance Act of 1948. The preceding sentence shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;'.

"SEC. 303. Paragraph (3) of section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey' (61 Stat. 103) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(3) by detailing to the United States missions to Greece or Turkey or China under this act, or to the governments of those countries in implementation of the purposes of this act, a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only; and the provisions of the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall, except as otherwise provided herein, be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph;'.

"SEC. 304. (a) Subsection (a) of section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey' (61 Stat. 103), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make additional advances, not to exceed in the aggregate $50,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine. No interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose.'

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey' (61 Stat. 103), is hereby amended by deleting '$400,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$675,000,000' and by inserting after the word 'repaid' the following: 'without interest.'

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $150,000,000 to carry out the provisions of the Act of May 22, 1947 (Public Law 75, Eightieth Congress), as amended, in relation to China.

"SEC. 305. The act entitled 'An act to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey' (61 Stat. 103), including the title thereof, is amended by inserting before the word 'Greece,' wherever appearing therein, the following: 'China,': *Provided, however*, That this section shall apply neither to the preamble of such act nor to the amendments to such act made by sections 302 and 303 of this title.

"TITLE IV

"SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the 'China Aid Act of 1948.'

"SEC. 402. Recognizing the intimate economic and other relationships between the United States and China, and recognizing that disruption following in the wake of war is not contained by national frontiers, the Congress finds that the existing situation in China endangers the establishment of a lasting peace, the general welfare and national interest of the United States, and the attainment of the objectives of the United Nations. It is the sense of the Congress that the further evolution in China of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence rests largely upon the continuing development of a strong and democratic national government as the basis for the establishment of sound economic and political conditions and for stable international economic and political relationships. Mindful of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to China, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the Republic of China and its people to exert sustained common efforts which will speedily achieve the internal peace and economic stability in China which are essential for lasting peace and prosperity in the world. It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the Republic of China in its efforts to maintain the genuine independence and the administrative integrity of China, and to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty and free institutions in China through a program of assistance based on self-help and cooperation: *Provided*, That no assistance to China herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States. It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that assistance provided by the United States under this title should at all times be dependent upon cooperation by the Republic of China and its people in furthering the program: *Provided further*, That assistance furnished under this title shall not be construed as an express or implied assumption by the United States of any responsibility for policies, acts, or undertakings of the Republic of China or for conditions which may prevail in China at any time.

"SEC. 403. In addition to the amount authorized by section 11 (a) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.), appropriations in the amount of $420,000,000 are hereby authorized for assistance to China under such act until June 30, 1949, and such act is hereby amended accordingly: *Provided*, That—

"(a) paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 4, section 10, and section 11 (b) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 shall not apply with respect to China;

"(b) the agreement provided for by section 5 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (1) shall, to the extent practicable, make appropriate provision for the matters covered by paragraphs (1), (2), (4), (5), (7), (8), (9), and (10) of subsection (b) of section 115 of title I; and (2) may contain such other undertakings by China as are necessary to improve commercial relations between China and the United States, consistent with the purposes of this title: *Provided*, That the provision for the disposal of any unencumbered balance of local currency deposits provided for in section 5 (b) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 shall not be effective with respect to China until September 30, 1949;

"(c) the authority to procure or provide for the procurement of commodities for China shall include authority to procure or provide for the procurement of such other commodities and services in addition to those specified in section 3 (a) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and for the furnishing of technical assistance as the President deems necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of this title;

"(d) without regard to the provisions of section 5 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947, assistance under such act may be provided for China during the 3 months following the date of enactment of this act when the President determines it to be essential in furtherance of the purposes of this title;

"(e) the provisions of sections 104, 105, 107, 110, 111 (c) (1), 112, 113, 117, 119, and 121 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 shall be applicable to the furnishing of assistance for China under the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions are applicable to the furnishing of assistance to participating countries under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948;

"(f) when it is determined that assistance should be extended under the provisions of this title on credit terms, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation shall allocate funds for the purpose to the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which shall, notwithstanding the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 526), as amended, make and administer the credit on terms specified by the Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. The Administrator shall make advances to, or reimburse, the Export-Import Bank of Washington for necessary administrative expenses in connection with such credits. The bank shall deposit into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, amounts received by the bank in repayment of principal and interest on any such credits. Credits made by the Export-Import Bank of Washington with funds so allocated to it by the Administrator shall not be considered in determining whether the bank has outstanding at any one time loans and guaranties to the extent of the limitation imposed by section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 529), as amended;

"(g) notwithstanding the appropriation made by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, for foreign aid, the provisions of section 11 (d) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 shall be applicable for carrying out the provisions of this act;

"(h) not less than 5 percent nor more than 10 percent of the funds made available for the purposes of this title shall be used to carry out the purposes of section 404.

"SEC. 404. The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Administrator, is hereby authorized to conclude an agreement with China establishing a Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction in China, to be composed of two citizens of the United States appointed by the President of the United States and three citizens of China appointed by the President of China. Such Commission shall, subject to the direction and control of the Administrator, formulate and carry out a program for reconstruction in rural areas of China, which shall include

such research and training activities as may be necessary or appropriate for such reconstruction: *Provided*, That assistance furnished under this section shall not be construed as an express or implied assumption by the United States of any responsibility for making any further contributions to carry out the purposes of this section.

"SEC. 405. There shall be established in China a special mission under the direction of a chief who shall be responsible for assuring the performance within China of operations under this title, and who shall take rank immediately after the chief of the United States diplomatic mission in China.

"The chief shall be appointed by the Administrator, shall receive his instructions from the Administrator, and shall report to the Administrator on the performance of the duties assigned to him. He shall keep the chief of the United States diplomatic mission in China fully and currently informed on matters, including prospective action, arising within the scope of the operations of the special mission; and the chief of the diplomatic mission in China shall keep the chief of the special mission fully and currently informed on matters relative to the conduct of the duties of the chief of the special mission. The chief of the special mission shall also keep the Administrator, the Secretary of State, the chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the House Appropriations Committee currently informed concerning his activities. The chief of the United States diplomatic mission will be responsible for assuring that the operations of the special mission are consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States in China and to that end whenever the chief of the United States diplomatic mission believes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act on the part of the special mission is inconsistent with such foreign policy objectives, he shall so advise the chief of the special mission. If differences of view are not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the Secretary of State and the Administrator for decision."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through economic, financial, and other measures necessary to the maintenance of conditions abroad in which free institutions may survive and consistent with the maintenance of the strength and stability of the United States."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; that it disagree to the amendment of the House to the title; that it agrees to the conference asked by the House; that it insist upon its amendment, ask 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 Presiding Officer appointed Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. GEORGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

The amendment proposed by Mr. VANDENBERG in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. That this title may be cited as 'The Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.'

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 102. (a) Recognizing the intimate economic and other relationships between the United States and the nations of Europe, and recognizing that disruption following in the wake of war is not contained by national frontiers, the Congress finds that the existing situation in Europe endangers the establishment of a lasting peace, the general welfare and national interest of the United States, and the attainment of the objectives of the United Nations. The restoration or maintenance in European countries of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence rests largely upon the establishment of sound economic conditions, stable international economic relationships, and the achievement by the countries of Europe of a healthy economy independent of extraordinary outside assistance. The accomplishment of these objectives calls for a plan of European recovery, open to all such nations which cooperate in such plan, based upon a strong production effort, the expansion of foreign trade, the creation and maintenance of internal financial stability, and the development of economic cooperation, including all possible steps to establish and maintain equitable rates of exchange and to bring about the progressive elimination of trade barriers. Mindful of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to the countries of Europe, it is the hope of the people of the United States that these countries through a joint organization will exert sustained common efforts which will speedily achieve that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. Accordingly, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe through assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation: *Provided*, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States. It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that continuity of assistance provided by the United States should, at all times be dependent upon continuity of cooperation among countries participating in the program.

"PURPOSES OF TITLE

"(b) It is the purpose of this title to effectuate the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section by furnishing material and financial assistance to the participating countries in such a manner as to aid them, through their own individual and concerted efforts, to become independent of extraordinary outside economic assistance within the period of operations under this title, by—

"(1) promoting industrial and agricultural production in the participating countries;

"(2) furthering the restoration or maintenance of the soundness of European currencies, budgets, and finances; and

"(3) facilitating and stimulating the growth of international trade of participating countries with one another and with other countries by appropriate measures including reduction of barriers which may hamper such trade.

"PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES

"SEC. 103. As used in this title, the term 'participating country' means—

"(a) any country, together with dependent areas under its administration, which signed the report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation at Paris on September 22, 1947; and

"(b) any other country (including any of the zones of occupation of Germany, any areas under international administration or control, and the Free Territory of Trieste or either of its zones) wholly or partly in Europe, together with dependent areas under its administration; provided such country adheres to, and for so long as it remains an adherent to, a joint program for European recovery designed to accomplish the purpose of this title.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 104. (a) There is hereby established, with its principal office in the District of Columbia, an agency of the Government which shall be known as the Economic Cooperation Administration, hereinafter referred to as the Administration. The Administration shall be headed by an Administrator for Economic Cooperation, hereinafter referred to as the Administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum. The Administrator shall be responsible to the President and shall have a status in the executive branch of the Government comparable to that of the head of an executive department. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the administration of the provisions of this title is hereby vested in the Administrator and his functions shall be performed under the control of the President.

"(b) There shall be in the Administration a Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. The Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation shall perform such functions as the Administrator shall designate, and shall be Acting Administrator for Economic Cooperation during the absence or disability of the Administrator or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Administrator.

"(c) The President is authorized, pending the appointment and qualification of the first Administrator or Deputy Administrator for Economic Cooperation appointed hereunder, to provide, for a period of not to exceed 30 days after the date of enactment of this title, for the performance of the functions of the Administrator under this title through such departments, agencies, or establishments of the United States Government as he may direct. In the event the President nominates an Administrator or Deputy Administrator prior to the expiration of such 30-day period, the authority conferred upon the President by this subsection shall be extended beyond such 30-day period but only until an Administrator or Deputy Administrator qualifies and takes office.

"(d) Any department, agency, or establishment of the Government (including, whenever used in this title, any corporation which is an instrumentality of the United States) performing functions under this title is authorized to employ, for duty within the continental limits of the United States, such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this title, and funds available pursuant to section 14 of this title shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 219). Of such personnel employed by the Administration, not to exceed 60 may be compensated without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of whom not more than 10 may be compensated at a rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, but not in excess of $15,000 per annum. Experts and consultants or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 55a), may be employed by the Administration, and individuals so employed may be compensated at rates not in excess of $50 per diem and while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be paid actual travel expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of sub-

sistence and other expenses while so employed.

"(e) The head of any department, agency, or establishment of the Government performing functions under this title may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out his functions under this title, and he may delegate authority to perform any of such functions to his subordinates, acting under his direction and under rules and regulations promulgated by him.

"GENERAL FUNCTIONS OF ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 105. (a) The Administrator, under the control of the President, shall in addition to all other functions vested in him by this title—

"(1) review and appraise the requirements of participating countries for assistance under the terms of this title;

"(2) formulate programs of United States assistance under this title, including approval of specific projects which have been submitted to him by the participating countries;

"(3) provide for the efficient execution of any such programs as may be placed in operation; and

"(4) terminate provision of assistance or take other remedial action as provided in section 17 of this title.

"(b) In order to strengthen and make more effective the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States—

"(1) the Administrator and the Secretary of State shall keep each other fully and currently informed on matters, including prospective action, arising within the scope of their respective duties which are pertinent to the duties of the other;

"(2) whenever the Secretary of State believes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act on the part of the Administrator is inconsistent with the foreign-policy objectives of the United States, he shall consult with the Administrator and, if differences of view are not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the President for final decision.

"(c) The Administrator and the department, agency, or officer in the executive branch of the Government exercising the authority granted to the President by section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, shall keep each other fully and currently informed on matters, including prospective action, arising within the scope of their respective duties which are pertinent to the duties of the other. Whenever the Administrator believes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act on the part of such department, agency, or officer is inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of this title, he shall consult with such department, agency, or officer and, if differences of view are not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the President for final decision.

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

"SEC. 106. Section 4 (a) of the Bretton Woods Agreement Act (59 Stat. 512, 513) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 4. (a) In order to coordinate the policies and operations of the representatives of the United States on the Fund and the Bank and of all agencies of the Government which make or participate in making foreign loans or which engage in foreign financial exchange or monetary transactions, there is hereby established the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"), consisting of the Secretary of Treasury as Chairman, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and during such period as the Economic Cooperation Administration shall continue to exist, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation.'

"PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 107. (a) There is hereby created a Public Advisory Board, hereinafter referred to as the Board, which shall advise and consult with the Administrator with respect to general or basic policy matters arising in connection with the Administrator's discharge of his responsibilities. The Board shall consist of the Administrator, who shall be Chairman, and not to exceed 12 additional members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be selected from among citizens of the United States of broad and varied experience in matters affecting the public interest, other than officers and employees of the United States (including any agency or instrumentality of the United States) who, as such, regularly receive compensation for current services. The Board shall meet at least once a month and at other times upon the call of the Administrator or when three or more members of the Board request the Administrator to call a meeting. Not more than a majority of two of the members shall be appointed to the Board from the same political party. Members of the Board, other than the Administrator, shall receive, out of funds made available for the purposes of this act, a per diem allowance of $50 for each day spent away from their homes or regular places of business, for the purpose of attendance at meetings of the Board, or at conferences held upon the call of the Administrator, and in necessary travel, and while so engaged, they may be paid actual traveling expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

"(b) The Administrator may appoint such other advisory committees as he may determine to be necessary or desirable to effectuate the purposes of this title.

"UNITED STATES SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE ABROAD

"SEC. 108. There shall be a United States Special Representative in Europe who shall (a) be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (b) be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 1, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), and (c) have the rank of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary. He shall be the representative of the Administrator, and shall also be the chief representative of the United States Government to any organization of participating countries which may be established by such countries to further a joint program for European recovery, and shall discharge in Europe such additional responsibilities as may be assigned to him with the approval of the President in furtherance of the purposes of this act. He may also be designated as the United States representative on the Economic Commission for Europe. He shall receive his instructions from the Administrator and such instructions shall be prepared and transmitted to him in accordance with procedures agreed to between the Administrator and the Secretary of State in order to assure appropriate coordination as provided by subsection (b) of section 105 of this title. He shall coordinate the activities of the Chiefs of Special Missions provided for in section 109 of this title. He shall keep the Administrator, the Secretary of State, the chiefs of the United States diplomatic missions, and the chiefs of the special missions provided for in section 109 of this title currently informed concerning his activities. He shall consult with the chiefs of all such missions, who shall give him such cooperation as he may require for the performance of his duties under this act.

"SPECIAL ECA MISSIONS ABROAD

"SEC. 109. (a) There shall be established in each participating country, except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, a special mission for economic cooperation under the direction of a chief who shall be responsible for assuring the performance within such country of operations under this title. The chief shall be appointed by the Administrator, shall receive his instructions from the Administrator, and shall report to the Administrator on the performance of the duties assigned to him. The chief of the special mission shall take rank immediately after the chief of the United States diplomatic mission in such country.

"(b) The chief of the special mission shall keep the chief of the United States diplomatic mission fully and currently informed on matters, including prospective action, arising within the scope of the operations of the special mission and the chief of the diplomatic mission shall keep the chief of the special mission fully and currently informed on matters relative to the conduct of the duties of the chief of the special mission. The chief of the United States diplomatic mission will be responsible for assuring that the operations of the special mission are consistent with the foreign-policy objectives of the United States in such country and to that end whenever the chief of the United States diplomatic mission believes that any action, proposed action, or failure to act on the part of the special mission is inconsistent with such foreign-policy objectives, he shall so advise the chief of the special mission and the United States special representative in Europe. If differences of view are not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the Secretary of State and the Administrator for decision.

"(c) The Secretary of State shall provide such office space, facilities, and other administrative services for the United States Special Representative in Europe and his staff, and for the special mission in each participating country, as may be agreed between the Secretary of State and the Administrator.

"(d) With respect to any of the zones of occupation of Germany and of the Free Territory of Trieste, during the period of occupation, the President shall make appropriate administrative arrangements for the conduct of operations under this title, in order to enable the Administrator to carry out his responsibility to assure the accomplishment of the purposes of this title.

"PERSONNEL OUTSIDE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 110. (a) For the purpose of performing functions under this title outside the continental limits of the United States the Administrator may—

"(1) employ persons who shall receive compensation at any of the rates provided for the Foreign Service Reserve and Staff by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), together with allowances and benefits established thereunder; and

"(2) recommend the appointment or assignment of persons, and the Secretary of State may appoint or assign such persons, to any class in the Foreign Service Reserve or Staff for the duration of operations under this act, and the Secretary of State may thereafter assign, transfer, or promote such persons upon the recommendation of the Administrator. Persons so appointed to the Foreign Service Staff shall be entitled to the benefits of section 528 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

"(b) For the purpose of performing functions under this act outside the continental limits of the United States, the Secretary of State may, at the request of the Administrator, appoint, for the duration of operations under this title, alien clerks and employees in accordance with applicable provisions of

the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999).

"(c) Civilian personnel who are citizens or residents of the United States employed or appointed pursuant to this section to perform functions under this title shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation which shall make a report thereof to the appointing authority as soon as possible. *Provided, however,* That they may temporarily assume their posts and perform their functions after preliminary investigation and clearance by the Administrator or the Secretary of State, as the case may be, but such employment may be terminated after the receipt of the report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"NATURE AND METHOD OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 111. (a) The Administrator may, from time to time, furnish assistance to any participating country by providing for the performance of any of the functions set forth in paragraphs (1) through (6) of this subsection when he deems it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this title, and upon the terms and conditions set forth in this title and such additional terms and conditions consistent with the provisions of this title as he may determine to be necessary and proper.

"(1) Procurement from any source, including Government stocks, of any commodity which he determines to be required for the furtherance of the purposes of this title. As used in this title, the term 'commodity' means any commodity, material, article, supply, or goods necessary for the purposes of this title.

"(2) Processing, storing, transporting, and repairing any commodities, or performing any other services with respect to a participating country which he determines to be required for accomplishing the purposes of this title.

"The Administrator shall, in providing for the procurement of commodities under authority of this title, take such steps as may be necessary to assure, so far as is practicable, that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities, procured within the United States out of funds made available under this act and transported abroad on ocean vessels, is so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates.

"(3) Procurement of and furnishing technical information and assistance.

"(4) Transfer of any commodity or service, which transfer shall be signified by delivery of the custody and right of possession and use of such commodity, or otherwise making available any such commodity, or by rendering a service to a participating country or to any agency or organization representing a participating country.

"(5) The allocation of commodities or services to specific projects designed to carry out the purposes of this title, which have been submitted to the Administrator by participating countries and have been approved by him.

"(b) The Administrator may provide for the performance of any of the functions described in subsection (a) of this section—

"(1) by establishing accounts against which, under regulations prescribed by the Administrator—

"(i) letters of commitment may be issued in connection with supply programs approved by the Administrator (and such letters of commitment, when issued, shall constitute obligations of applicable appropriations); and

"(ii) withdrawals may be made by participating countries, or agencies or organizations representing participating countries, upon presentation of contracts, invoices, or other documentation specified by the Administrator.

Such accounts may be established on the books of the Administration, or any other department, agency, or establishment of the Government specified by the Administrator, or, on terms and conditions approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, in banking institutions in the United States. Expenditures of funds which have been made available through accounts so established shall be accounted for on standard documentation required for expenditures of Government funds: *Provided,* That such expenditures for commodities or services procured outside the continental limits of the United States under authority of this section may be accounted for exclusively on such certification as the Administrator may prescribe to assure expenditure in furtherance of the purposes of this title, and such certification shall be binding on the accounting officers of the Government.

"(2) by utilizing the services and facilities of any department, agency, or establishment of the Government as the President shall direct, or with the consent of the head of such department, agency, or establishment, or, in the President's discretion, by acting in cooperation with the United Nations or with other international organizations or with agencies of the participating countries, and funds allocated pursuant to this section to any department, agency, or establishment of the Government shall be established in separate appropriation accounts on the books of the Treasury.

"(3) by making, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator, guaranties to any person of investments in connection with projects approved by the Administrator and the participating country concerned as furthering the purposes of this title, which guaranties shall terminate not later than 14 years from the date of enactment of this title: *Provided,* That—

"(i) the guaranty to any person shall not exceed the amount of dollars invested in the project by such person with the approval of the Administrator and shall be limited to the transfer into United States dollars of other currencies, or credits in such currencies, received by such person as income from the approved investment, as repayment or return thereof, in whole or in part, or as compensation for the sale or disposition of all or any part thereof;

"(ii) the total liabilities assumed under such guaranties shall not exceed 5 percent of the total funds appropriated for the purposes of this title and any liabilities accruing under such guaranties shall be defrayed within the limits of funds so appropriated; and

"(iii) as used in this paragraph, the term 'person' means a citizen of the United States or any corporation, partnership, or other association created under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory and substantially beneficially owned by citizens of the United States.

"(4) (i) By making, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator, guaranties to any person or government in the Western Hemisphere with respect to credits any such person or government may grant for commodities and services to be transferred, with the approval of the Administrator, to a participating country: *Provided,* That guaranties to governments in the Western Hemisphere shall not exceed 70 percent of the credits so extended by any such government: *And provided further,* That the Administrator determines that the use of this method of guaranteeing credits, as opposed to this method of direct procurement and delivery to participating countries, will not substantially prejudice the extension or validity of credits or loans by other governments, by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, or by private persons, where such credits or loans have been, or in the future might be, prudently made without such guaranty, considering the capacity of the several participating countries to repay. In determining whether to provide for the procurement of commodities and services outside the continental limits of the United States, the Administrator shall take into account whether the government of the country in which commodities or services are available for transfer fails to extend such credits or to arrange such prices, terms, and conditions as the Administrator considers equitable and prudent in connection with such transfers. In connection with such guaranties, the Administrator, on terms and conditions prescribed by him, may agree to advance dollars on account of such guaranties at the time such exports are made, or at any time not more than 10 years after the making of such agreement.

"(ii) As used in this paragraph, the term 'person' means a citizen of any Western Hemisphere country, or any corporation, partnership, or other association created under the law of any such country or under any political subdivision thereof, and substantially owned by citizens of Western Hemisphere countries.

"(c) (1) The Administrator may provide assistance for any participating country, in the form and under the procedures authorized in subsections (a) and (b), respectively, of this section, through grants or upon payment in cash, or on credit terms, or on such other terms of payment as he may find appropriate, including payment by the transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator and the participating country) of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources. In determining whether such assistance shall be through grants or upon terms of payment, and in determining the terms of payment, he shall act in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, and the determination whether or not a participating country should be required to make payment for any assistance furnished to such country in furtherance of the purposes of this title, and the terms of such payment, if required, shall depend upon the character and purpose of the assistance and upon the capacity of such country to make such payments without jeopardizing the accomplishment of the purposes of this title.

"(2) When it is determined that assistance should be extended under the provisions of this title on credit terms, the Administrator shall allocate funds for the purpose to the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which shall, notwithstanding the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 526), as amended, make and administer the credit as directed, and on terms specified, by the Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. The Administrator shall make advances to, or reimburse, the Export-Import Bank of Washington for necessary administrative expenses in connection with such credits. The bank shall deposit into the Treasury of the United States, as miscellaneous receipts, amounts received by the bank in repayment of principal and interest on any such credits. Credits made by the Export-Import Bank of Washington with funds so allocated to it by the Administrator shall not be considered in determining whether the bank has outstanding at any one time loans and guaranties to the extent of the limitation imposed by section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 529), as amended.

"PROTECTION OF DOMESTIC ECONOMY

"SEC. 112. (a) The Administrator shall provide for the procurement in the United States of commodities under this title in such a way as to (1) minimize the drain upon the resources of the United States and the impact of such procurement upon the domestic economy, and (2) avoid impairing

the fulfillment of vital needs of the people of the United States.

"(b) The procurement of petroleum and petroleum products under this title shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be made from petroleum sources outside the United States; and, in furnishing commodities under the provisions of this act, the Administrator shall take fully into account the present and anticipated world shortage of petroleum and its products and the consequent undesirability of expansion in petroleum-consuming equipment where the use of alternate fuels or other sources of power is practicable.

"(c) In order to assure the conservation of domestic grain supplies and the retention in the United States of byproduct feeds necessary to the maintenance of the agricultural economy of the United States, the amounts of wheat and wheat flour produced in the United States to be transferred by grant to the participating countries shall be so determined that the total quantity of wheat used to produce the wheat flour transferred to such countries under this title shall not be less than 25 percent of the aggregate of the unprocessed wheat and wheat in the form of flour transferred to such countries under this title.

"(d) The term 'surplus agricultural commodity' as used in this section is defined as any agricultural commodity, or product thereof, produced in the United States which is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of domestic requirements. In providing for the procurement of any such surplus agricultural commodity for transfer by grant to any participating country in accordance with the requirements of such country, the Administrator shall, insofar as practicable and where in furtherance of the purposes of this title, give effect to the following:

"(1) The Administrator shall authorize the procurement of any such surplus agricultural commodity only within the United States: *Provided,* That this restriction shall not be applicable (i) to any agricultural commodity, or product thereof, located in one participating country, and intended for transfer to another participating country, if the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, determines that such procurement and transfer is in furtherance of the purposes of this title, and would not create a burdensome surplus in the United States or seriously prejudice the position of domestic producers of such surplus agricultural commodities, or (ii) if, and to the extent that any such surplus agricultural commodity is not available in the United States in sufficient quantities to supply the requirements of the participating countries under this title.

"(2) In providing for the procurement of any such surplus agricultural commodity, the Administrator shall, insofar as practicable and applicable, and after giving due consideration to the excess of any such commodity over domestic requirements, and to the historic reliance of United States producers of any such surplus agricultural commodity upon markets in the participating countries, provide for the procurement of each class or type of any such surplus agricultural commodity in the approximate proportion that the Secretary of Agriculture determines such classes or types bear to the total amount of excess of such surplus agricultural commodity over domestic requirements.

"(e) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that any quantity of any surplus agricultural commodity, heretofore or hereafter acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation in the administration of its price-support programs, is available for use in furnishing assistance to foreign countries, he shall so advise all departments, agencies, and establishments of the Government administering laws providing for the furnishing of assistance or relief to foreign countries (including occupied or liberated countries or areas of such countries). Thereafter the department, agency, or establishment administering any such law shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of such law, and where for transfer by grant and in accordance with the requirements of such foreign country, procure or provide for the procurement of such quantity of such surplus agricultural commodity. The sales price paid as reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for any such surplus agricultural commodity shall be in such amount as Commodity Credit Corporation determines will fully reimburse it for the cost to it of such surplus agricultural commodity at the time and place such surplus agricultural commodity is delivered by it, but in no event shall the sales price be higher than the domestic market price at such time and place of delivery as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Agriculture may pay not to exceed 50 percent of such sales price as authorized by subsection (e) of this section.

"(f) Subject to the provisions of this section, but notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to encourage utilization of surplus agricultural commodities pursuant to this or any other act providing for assistance or relief to foreign countries, the Secretary of Agriculture, in carrying out the purposes of clause (1), section 32, Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, may make payments, including payments to any government agency procuring or selling such surplus agricultural commodities, in an amount not to exceed 50 percent of the sales price (basis free along ship or free on board vessel, United States ports), as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, of such surplus agricultural commodities. The recission of the remainder of section 32 funds by the act of July 30, 1947 (Public Law 266, 80th Cong.), is hereby canceled and such funds are hereby made available for the purposes of section 32 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

"(g) No export shall be authorized pursuant to authority conferred by section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), including any amendment thereto, of any commodity from the United States to any country wholly or partly in Europe which is not a participating country, if the Secretary of Commerce determined that the supply of such commodity is insufficient (or would be insufficient if such export were permitted) to fulfill the requirements of participating countries under this title as determined by the Administrator: *Provided, however,* That such export may be authorized if the Secretary of Commerce determines that such export is otherwise in the national interest of the United States.

"(h) In providing for the performance of any of the functions described in subsection (a) of section 111, the Administrator shall, to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this title, utilize private channels of trade.

"REIMBURSEMENT TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

"SEC. 113. (a) The Administrator shall make reimbursement or payment, out of funds available for the purposes of this title, for any commodity, service, or facility procured under section 111 of this title from any department, agency, or establishment of the Government. Such reimbursement or payment shall be made to the owning or disposal agency, as the case may be, at replacement cost, or, if required by law at actual cost, or at any other price authorized by law and agreed to between the Administrator and such agency. The amount of any reimbursement or payment to an owning agency for commodities, services, or facilities so procured shall be credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which there may be procured replacements of similar commodities or such services or facilities: *Provided,* That such commodities, services, or facilities may be procured from an owning agency only with the consent of such agency: *And provided further,* That where such appropriations, funds, or accounts are not reimbursable except by reason of this subsection, and when the owning agency determines that replacement of any commodity procured under authority of this section is not necessary, any funds received in payment therefor shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(b) The Administrator, whenever in his judgment the interests of the United States will best be served thereby, may dispose of any commodity procured out of funds made available for the purposes of this title, in lieu of transferring such commodity to a participating country, (1) by transfer of such commodity, upon reimbursement, to any department, agency, or establishment of the Government for use or disposal by such department, agency, or establishment as authorized by law, or (2) without regard to provisions of law relating to the disposal of Government-owned property, when necessary to prevent spoilage or wastage of such commodity or to conserve the usefulness thereof. Funds realized from such disposal or transfer shall revert to the respective appropriation or appropriations out of which the funds were expended for the procurement of such commodity.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 114. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $1,000,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this title, in such manner, at such time and in such amounts as the President shall determine, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest from appropriations authorized under this title for advances made by it hereunder.

"(b) Such part as the President may determine of the unobligated and unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds available for the purposes of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 shall be available for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(c) In order to carry out the provisions of this title with respect to those participating countries which adhere to the purposes of this title, and remain eligible to receive assistance hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, from time to time through June 30, 1952, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this title: *Provided, however,* That for carrying out the provisions and accomplishing the purposes of this title for the period of 1 year following the date of enactment of this title, there are hereby authorized to be so appropriated not to exceed $5,300,000,000.

"(d) Funds made available for the purposes of this title shall be available for incurring and defraying all necessary expenses incident to carrying out the provisions of this act, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation, allowances and travel of personnel, including Foreign Service personnel whose services are utilized primarily for the purposes of this title, and, without regard to the provisions of any other law, for printing and binding, and for expenditures outside the continental limits of the United States for the procurement of supplies and services and for other administrative purposes (other than compensation of personnel) without regard to such

laws and regulations governing the obligation and expenditure of government funds, as the Administrator shall specify in the interest of the accomplishment of the purposes of this title.

"(e) The unexpended portions of any deposits which may have been made by any participating country pursuant to section 6 of the joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and section 5 (b) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.) may be merged with the deposits to be made by such participating country in accordance with section 115 (b) (6) of this title, and shall be held or used under the same terms and conditions as are provided in section 115 (b) (6) of this title.

"(f) In order to reserve some part of the surplus of the fiscal year 1948 for payments thereafter to be made under this title, there is hereby created on the books of the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the Foreign Economic Cooperation Trust Fund. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an amount of $3,000,000,000, out of sums appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in this title, shall, when appropriated, be transferred immediately to the trust fund, and shall thereupon be considered as expended during the fiscal year 1948, for the purpose of reporting governmental expenditures. The Secretary of the Treasury shall be the sole trustee of the trust fund and is authorized and directed to pay out of the fund such amounts as the Administrator shall duly requisition. The first expenditures made out of the appropriations authorized under this title in the fiscal year 1949 shall be made with funds requisitioned by the Administrator out of the trust fund until the fund is exhausted, at which time such fund shall cease to exist. The provisions of this subsection shall not be construed as affecting the application of any provision of law which would otherwise govern the obligation of funds so appropriated or the auditing or submission of accounts of transactions with respect to such funds.

"BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL UNDERTAKINGS

"SEC. 115. (a) The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Administrator, is authorized to conclude, with individual participating countries or any number of such countries or with an organization representing any such countries, agreements in furtherance of the purposes of this title.

"(b) The provision of assistance under this title results from the multilateral pledges of the participating countries to use all their efforts to accomplish a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation as embodied in the report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation signed at Paris on September 22, 1947, and is contingent upon continuous effort of the participating countries to accomplish a joint recovery program through multilateral undertakings and the establishment of a continuing organization for this purpose. In addition to continued mutual cooperation of the participating countries in such a program, each such country shall conclude an agreement with the United States in order for such country to be eligible to receive assistance under this title. Such agreement shall provide for the adherence of such country to the purposes of this title and shall, where applicable, make appropriate provision, among others, for—

"(1) promoting industrial and agricultural production in order to enable the participating country to become independent of extraordinary outside economic assistance; and submitting for the approval of the Administrator, upon his request and whenever he deems it in furtherance of the purposes of this title, specific projects proposed by such country to be undertaken in substantial part with assistance furnished under this title, which projects, whenever practicable, shall include projects for increased production of coal, steel, transportation facilities, and food;

"(2) taking financial and monetary measures necessary to stabilize its currency, establish or maintain a valid rate of exchange, to balance its governmental budget as soon as practicable, and generally to restore or maintain confidence in its monetary system;

"(3) cooperating with other participating countries in facilitating and stimulating an increasing interchange of goods and services among the particpating countries and with other countries and cooperating to reduce barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries;

"(4) making efficient and practical use, within the framework of a joint program for European recovery, of the resources of such participating country, including any commodities, facilities, or services furnished under this title, which use shall include, to the extent practicable, taking measures to locate and control, in furtherance of such program, assets, and earnings therefrom, which belong to the citizens of such country and which are situated within the United States, its Territories and possessions;

"(5) facilitating the transfer to the United States by sale, exchange, barter, or otherwise for stock-piling purposes, for such period of time as may be agreed to and upon reasonable terms and in reasonable quantities, of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources, and which may be available in such participating country after due regard for reasonable requirements for domestic use and commercial export of such country;

"(6) placing in a special account a deposit in the currency of such country, in commensurate amounts and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed to between such country and the Government of the United States, when any commodity or service is made available through any means authorized under this title, and is not furnished to the participating country on terms of payment. Such special account, together with the unexpended portions of any deposits which may have been made by such country pursuant to section 6 of the joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and section 5 (b) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.), shall be held or used only for such purposes as may be agreed to between such country and the Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, and under agreement that any unencumbered balance remaining in such account on June 30, 1952, will be disposed of within such country for such purposes as may, subject to approval by act or joint resolution of the Congress, be agreed to between such country and the Government of the United States;

"(7) publishing in such country and transmitting to the United States, not less frequently than every calendar quarter after the date of the agreement, full statements of operations under the agreement, including a report of the use of funds, commodities, and services received under this title; and

"(8) furnishing promptly, upon request of the United States, any relevant information which would be of assistance to the United States in determining the nature and scope of operations and the use of assistance provided under this title.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the Administrator, during the three months after the date of enactment of this title, may perform with respect to any participating country any of the functions authorized under this title which he may determine to be essential in furtherance of the purposes of this title, if such country (1) has signified its adherence to the purposes of this title and its intention to conclude an agreement pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and (2) he finds that such country is complying with the applicable provisions of subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, that, notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, the Administrator may, through June 30, 1948, provide for the transfer of food, medical supplies, fibers, fuel, petroleum and petroleum products, fertilizer, pesticides, and seed to any country of Europe which participated in the Committee of European Economic Cooperation and which undertook pledges to the other participants therein, when the Administrator determines that the transfer of any such supplies to any such country is essential in order to make it possible to carry out the purposes of this title by alleviating conditions of hunger and cold and by preventing serious economic retrogression.

"(d) The Administrator shall encourage the joint organization of the participating countries referred to in subsection (b) of this section to ensure that each participating country makes efficient use of the resources of such country, including any commodities, facilities, or services furnished under this title, by observing and reviewing such use through an effective follow-up system approved by the joint organization.

"(e) It is the understanding of the Congress that, in accordance with agreements now in effect, prisoners of war remaining in participating countries shall if they so freely elect be repatriated prior to January 1, 1949.

"WESTERN HEMISPHERE COUNTRIES

"SEC. 116. The President shall take appropriate steps to encourage all countries in the Western Hemisphere to make available to participating countries such assistance as they may be able to furnish.

"OTHER DUTIES OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 117. (a) The Administrator, in furtherance of the purposes of section 15 (b) (5), and in agreement with a participating country, may promote, by means of funds made available for the purposes of this title, an increase in the production in such participating country of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in the resources within the United States.

"(b) The Administrator, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall facilitate and encourage, through private and public travel, transport, and other agencies, the promotion and development of travel by citizens of the United States to and within participating countries.

"(c) In order to further the efficient use of United States voluntary contributions for relief in participating countries receiving assistance under this title in the form of grants, funds made available for the purposes of this title may be used, in the discretion of the Administrator, and under rules and regulations prescribed by him, to pay ocean freight charges from a United States port to a designated foreign port of entry (1) of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies licensed for operations in Europe, or (2) of relief packages conforming to such specified size, weight, and contents, as the Administrator may prescribe originating in the United States and consigned to an individual residing in a participating country receiving assistance under this title in the form of grants.

"The Administrator may make an agreement with such country for the use of a portion of the deposit of local currency placed

in a special account pursuant to paragraph 6 of subsection (b) of section 115 of this title, for the purpose of defraying the transportation cost of such supplies and relief packages from the port of entry of such country to the designated shipping point of consignee.

"TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 118. The Administrator, in determining the form and measure of assistance provided under this title to any participating country, shall take into account the extent to which such country is complying with its undertakings embodied in its pledges to other participating countries and in its agreement concluded with the United States under section 115. The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title to any participating country whenever he determines that (1) such country is not adhering to its agreement concluded under section 115, or is diverting from the purposes of this title assistance provided hereunder, and that in the circumstances remedial action other than termination will not more effectively promote the purposes of this title or (2) because of changed conditions, assistance is no longer consistent with the national interest of the United States.

"EXEMPTION FROM CONTRACT AND ACCOUNTING LAWS

"SEC. 119. When the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this title, the functions authorized under this title may be performed without regard to such provisions of law regulating the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts and the expenditure of Government funds as the President may specify.

"EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS RELATING TO EMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 120. Service of an individual as a member of the Public Advisory Board (other than the Administrator) created by section 117 (a), as a member of an advisory committee appointed pursuant to section 117 (b), as an expert or consultant under section 114 (d), or as an expert, consultant, or technician under section 124 (d), shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), of section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99), or of section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

"UNITED NATIONS

"SEC. 121. (a) The President is authorized to request the cooperation of or the use of the services and facilities of the United Nations, its organs and specialized agencies, or other international organization, in carrying out the purposes of this title, and may make payments, by advancements or reimbursements, for such purpose, out of funds made available for the purposes of this title, as may be necessary therefor, to the extent that special compensation is usually required for such services and facilities.

"(b) The President shall cause to be transmitted to the Secretary General of the United Nations copies of reports to Congress on the operation conducted under this title.

"(c) Any agreements concluded between the United States and participating countries, or groups of such countries, in implementation of the purposes of this title, shall be registered with the United Nations if such registration is required by the Charter of the United Nations.

"TERMINATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 122. (a) After June 30, 1952, or after the date of the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress before such date, which declares that the powers conferred on the Administrator by or pursuant to subsection (a) of section 111 of this title are no longer necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of this title, whichever shall first occur, none of the functions authorized under such provisions may be exercised; except that during the 12 months following such date, commodities and services with respect to which the Administrator had, prior to such date, authorized procurement for, shipment to, or delivery in a participating country, may be transferred to such country, and funds appropriated under authority of this title may be obligated during such 12-month period for the necessary expenses of procurement, shipment, delivery, and other activities essential to such transfer, and shall remain available during such period for the necessary expenses of liquidating operations under this title.

"(b) At such time as the President shall find appropriate after such date, and prior to the expiration of the 12 months following such date, the powers, duties, and authority of the Administrator under this title may be transferred to such other departments, agencies, or establishments of the Government as the President shall specify, and the relevant funds, records, and personnel of the Administration may be transferred to the departments, agencies, or establishments to which the related functions are transferred.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 123. The President from time to time, but not less frequently than once every calendar quarter through June 30, 1952, and once every year thereafter until all operations under this title have been completed, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this title. Reports provided for under this section shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, if the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session.

"JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

"SEC. 124. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation (hereinafter referred to as the committee), and to be composed of seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House. In each instance, not more than four members shall be members of the same political party. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly, shall appoint a chairman and a vice chairman from among the members of the committee.

"(b) It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the programs of United States economic assistance to foreign countries, and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration of such programs. Upon request, the committee shall aid the several standing committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over any part of the programs of United States economic assistance to foreign countries; and it shall make a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives from time to time, concerning the results of its studies, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable. The Administrator, at the request of the committee, shall consult with the committee from time to time with respect to his activities under this title.

"(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, 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 provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

"(d) The committee is authorized to appoint and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and organizations thereof, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman.

"SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

"SEC. 125. If any provision of this title or the application of such provision to any circumstances or persons shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the title and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances or persons shall not be affected thereby.

"TITLE II

"ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

"SEC. 201. That in addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b) of section 4 of the act of May 22, 1947 (61 Stat. 103), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $275,000,000 to carry out the provisions of such act, as amended.

"SEC. 202. (a) Subsection (a) of section 4 of such act of May 22, 1947, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make additional advances, not to exceed in the aggregate $50,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this act, as amended, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine. No interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose."

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 4 of the said act is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'repaid' the following: 'without interest'.

"SEC. 203. Subsections (2) and (3) of section 1 of such act of May 22, 1947, are hereby amended to permit detailing of persons referred to in such subsections to the United States missions to Greece and Turkey, as well as to the Governments of those countries. Section 302 of the act of January 27, 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.), and section 10 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (relating to investigations of personnel by the Federal Bureau of Investigation) shall be applicable to any person so detailed pursuant to such subsection (2) of such act of 1947: *Provided*, That any military or civilian personnel detailed under section 1 of such act of 1947 may receive such station allowances or additional allowances as the President may prescribe (and payments of such allowances heretofore made are hereby validated).

"TITLE III

"AID TO CHINA

"SEC. 301. That this title may be cited as the 'China Aid Act of 1948.'

"SEC. 302. It is the purpose of this title to provide immediate aid to China to relieve human suffering to assist in retarding economic deterioration, and to afford the people of China an opportunity to initiate measures of self-help necessary to rebuilding the bases

for more stable economic conditions, such aid to be provided under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 which are consistent with the purposes of this title. It is not the purpose of this title that China, in order to receive aid hereunder, shall adhere to a joint program for European recovery.

"SEC. 303. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for aid to China a sum not to exceed $363,000,000 to remain available for obligation for the period of 1 year following the date of enactment of this title.

"(b) There is also hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President a sum not to exceed $100,000,000 for additional aid to China through grants, on such terms as the President may determine and without regard to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, to remain available for obligation for the period of 1 year following the date of enactment of this act.

"SEC. 304. An agreement shall be entered into between China and the United States containing those undertakings by China which the Secretary of State, after consultation with the Administrator for Economic Cooperation, may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this title and to improve commercial relations with China.

"SEC. 305. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation is made pursuant to section 303, to make advances, not to exceed in the aggregate $50,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this title in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine. From appropriations authorized under section 303, there shall be repaid without interest to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the advances made by it under the authority contained herein. No interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in implementation of this subsection."

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 March 31, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 203. An act to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 1 cent per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes; and

S. 2361. An act to provide for a temporary extension of the National Housing Act, as amended.

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 communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD (S. DOC. NO. 138)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Mediation Board, amounting to $48,800, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 139)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $50,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CONSERVATION OF GRAIN BY BREWING INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the voluntary allocation plan for conservation of grain by the brewing industry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A resolution adopted by the Richmond Hill Post, No. 212, the American Legion, Richmond Hill, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing selective service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Toledo (Ohio) Chapter of RONS-NROA, favoring the enactment of legislation providing universal military training, and so forth; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Yeshivah of Bensonhurst, Inc., of the Borough of Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to the partition of Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Keokuk (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce, favoring repeal of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution providing for income taxes, and the adoption of a substitute therefor, placing a limitation on the taxation of income; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 3569. A bill to authorize the construction of a chapel and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 1047); and

S. Res. 210. Resolution to investigate the shortage of petroleum products and natural gas, with amendments, and, under the rules, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration (Rept. No. 1046).

SHORTAGE OF RAILROAD CARS—INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE (REPT. NO. 1048)

Mr. REED, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolutions 47 and 44, an interim report relating to the shortage of railroad cars, which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

(Mr. TOBEY (by request) introduced Senate bill 2419, to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 568), as amended, to provide for the application to civil air navigation of laws and regulations related to animal and plant quarantine, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 2420. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for judicial review of orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board affecting the rights of domestic air carriers to engage in overseas or foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2421. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide school facilities for dependents of persons engaged on the construction, operation, and maintenance of certain projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. McGRATH (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. MURRAY) introduced Senate bill 2422, to provide for a national program of old-age retirement, survivors, and permanent disability insurance, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (by request):

S. 2423. A bill to amend section 3 (a) (c) and (e), section 5 (a) (i) i and ii, and section 6 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act approved August 29, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2424. A bill to authorize the Archivist of the United States to furnish copies of materials in his custody on a reimbursement of appropriations basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2425. A bill for the relief of Adam Styka and Wanda Engeman Styka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED:

S. 2426. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 2427. A bill to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. MAGNUSON introduced Senate Joint Resolution 202, to change the name of Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF AIR COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO LAWS AND REGULATIONS OF ANIMAL AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, at the request of the Department of Agriculture, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 568), as amended, to provide for the application to civil air navigation of laws and regulations related to animal and plant quarantine, and for other purposes, and I request that a letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture explaining the purpose of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the letter presented by the Senator from New Hampshire will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2419) to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 568), as amended, to provide for the application to civil air navigation of laws and regulations related to animal and plant quarantine, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TOBEY (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

MARCH 22, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore,
United States Senate,

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: In carrying out the responsibility to protect the agriculture of our country from the introduction, establishment, and spread of pests and diseases injurious to animals, plants, and their products, the Department of Agriculture is without authority to follow practices authorized by the Air Commerce Act to inform operators of civil aircraft concerning requirements and safeguards imposed by agricultural quarantines and regulations. The need for and importance of safeguards to prevent the entry or spread of injurious agricultural pests and diseases has long been recognized and provided for by the enactment of legislation and making of appropriations to carry out the purposes of the various laws. The following laws illustrate the type and character of authority under which the Department operates in carrying out responsibilities placed on it:

The following so-called animal quarantine acts:

Acts of May 29, 1884, February 2, 1903, and March 3, 1905, as amended (21 U. S. C. 111–130, 7 U. S. C. 391, and 18 U. S. C. 118).

Act of August 30, 1890 (21 U. S. C. 101–105).

Act of March 3, 1891, as amended (46 U. S. C. 466 a and b).

Section 306 (a) and (c) of the Tariff Act of June 17, 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C. 1306 (a) and (c)).

Act of March 3, 1905 (7 U. S. C. 141–144), the so-called Insect Pest Act.

Act of March 4, 1907, as amended (21 U. S. C. 71–95), the so-called Meat Inspection Act.

Act of August 20, 1912, as amended (7 U. S. C. 151–167), the so-called Plant Quarantine Act.

Act of March 4, 1913, 21 U. S. C. 151–158, the so-called Virus, Serum, and Toxin Act.

Act of July 24, 1919, 21 U. S. C. 96, the so-called Horse Meat Act.

Section 306 (b) and (c) of the Tariff Act of June 17, 1930, as amended, 19 U. S. C. 1306 (b) and (c), the so-called Imported Meat Act.

Act of January 31, 1942, 7 U. S. C. supp. V 149, the so-called Mexican Border Act.

These laws, and the regulations associated with them, provide for safeguarding the importation, exportation, transportation, and quarantine of animals, plants, certain of their products, insects, bacterial and fungus cultures, viruses, and serums, which may be injurious to our agriculture.

To enable the Department to follow practices which have been used and found effective by other agencies of the Government in carrying out responsibilities placed on them, it is recommended that the Air Commerce Act of 1926 be amended. Such amendment should authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue regulations which would make laws and regulations relating to animal and plant quarantines, including the importation, exportation, transportation, and quarantine of animals, plants, their products, insects, bacterial and fungus cultures, viruses, and serums applicable to civil air navigation. A draft of a bill which would provide such authority is attached.

The Air Commerce Act now authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce to provide by regulation for the application to civil air navigation of the laws and regulations pertaining to customs, immigration, and entry and clearance of vessels. The Public Health Service Act of 1944 contains comparable authority for the Surgeon General with respect to the public health laws and regulations. The proposed amendment would provide similar authority to this Department and thus permit including in the instructions to operators of civil aircraft arriving from abroad information concerning requirements of agricultural quarantines and regulations promulgated to safeguard our country from agricultural pests and diseases. The provisions of the proposed amendment would not in themselves require appropriations in addition to those needed to carry out responsibilities assigned the Department under existing legislation.

The idea of requesting authority such as would be provided by the proposed legislation has been discussed informally with representatives of interested governmental agencies. It has also been considered within the structure of the Air Coordinating Committee created by Executive Order 9781, September 19, 1946 (11 F. R. 10645). It is understood that those consulted consider the proposal desirable and the Air Coordinating Committee has advised the Department that it would support this request.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to submission of this proposed legislation and explanatory letter to the Congress for its consideration.

Bills before the Eightieth Congress, especially S. 1, H. R. 1699, and H. R. 2337 contemplate repeal of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 but provide for the reenactment of sections 7 and 11 of that act. The legislation here proposed could be accomplished by amending sections 7 and 11 in connection with their reenactment should the Congress deem it advisable to repeal the Air Commerce Act.

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD,
Under Secretary.

OLD-AGE RETIREMENT, SURVIVORS, AND PERMANENT DISABILITY INSURANCE

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for a national program of old-age retirement, survivors, and permanent-disability insurance, and I request that a statement I had intended to make in reference to the bill may 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. 2422) to provide for a national program of old-age retirement, survivors, and permanent-disability insurance, introduced by Mr. McGRATH (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR M'GRATH

Mr. President, on behalf of Senator WAGNER, Senator MURRAY, Representative DINGELL, and myself, I am introducing a comprehensive bill to extend and liberalize the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act.

The bill we are introducing today brings up-to-date a similar bill we four Democratic sponsors introduced in July 1947 as S. 1679 and H. R. 4303. The Republican leadership has not called hearings on these bills or on any other bills improving social security although the cost of living makes it impossible for persons receiving insurance benefits under the present law to live decently.

The bill we have introduced today is intended to adjust the benefits in accordance with the increased cost of living which has occurred since the Eightieth Congress first convened.

I understand from what the chairman of the Finance Committee said recently on the floor that the advisory council on social security appointed by his committee will make its report public very shortly.

I merely want to say that President Truman in his budget message of January 6 of this year has endorsed amendments to liberalize and extend the social-security program. Bills to carry out this end have been introduced. If the Republican leadership will agree to put social-security legislation on the calendar this session, I am sure we can do something that will help materially to improve the lot of the aged, widows and orphans and the disabled.

For those Senators who are interested, the bill I have introduced today may be briefly summarized as providing for:

1. Extension of insurance coverage to about 20,000,000 jobs now excluded from the insurance program. The newly covered employment includes self-employment (farmers, small-business men, and professional persons), agricultural labor, domestic service, employment by nonprofit institutions (such as hospitals, churches, and foundations), military service, and employment for State and local governments not covered under a pension plan. State and local employees will be covered only where the State enters into a voluntary compact with the Federal Security Administrator for such coverage.

2. Payment of insurance benefits in case of extended disability arising prior to age 65. This provision amounts to a flexible retirement provision for persons who become disabled for a period longer than 6 months.

3. Reduction of the retirement age from 65 to 60 for women employees, widows, wives, and mothers.

4. Increasing the amount of earnings which a beneficiary may receive without loss of his insurance benefit from $14.99 (as in the present law) to $40 per month.

5. Liberalization of the amount of the monthly insurance benefit depending upon the earnings of the insured individual and the number of his dependents, increasing the minimum monthly insurance benefit to $30 for a man and wife, and increasing the maximum monthly insurance benefit to $150 instead of the present $85 making it possible to pay more adequate insurance benefits, particularly where there are several children of a deceased or a disabled insured person.

6. Payment of a lump-sum burial benefit equal to 6 months insurance benefits in all cases where a deceased person dies insured. The present law provides for such a payment only in case no monthly insurance benefit is payable.

7. Payment of supplementary insurance benefits for a disabled aged husband or widower of a retired insured woman, and continuation of payment to a child of a retired or deceased person, after such child reaches 18, if such child is permanently disabled.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN NAME OF POTHOLES DAM TO O'SULLIVAN DAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to change the name of Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam, and I request that a statement by me, together with a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Moses Lake, Wash., may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and resolution presented by the Senator from

Washington will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 202) to change the name of Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON ON INTRODUCING PROPOSED BILL TO CHANGE NAME OF POTHOLES DAM TO O'SULLIVAN DAM, COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

Mr. President, today I am introducing a joint resolution to change the name of one of the key units in the great Columbia Basin project, from Potholes Dam to O'Sullivan Dam. I am doing this on behalf of the many residents of the Columbia Basin who know James O'Sullivan and who are deeply appreciative of his devotion, over half a lifetime, to this great project.

James O'Sullivan is now 72 years old. Since 1918 he has devoted most of his energy and effort to the development of the Grand Coulee Dam, and irrigation of Columbia Basin land. He has thrown every resource at his command into the battle. On numerous occasions in his fight for this project, his efforts were financed by the contributions of his neighbors, many of whom were able to pledge less than $5 per month to the enterprise. Jim mobilized the small resources of innumerable financially small people to carry on a fight, which at times, found these resources pitted against opposition financed by certain well-to-do foes of the project.

O'Sullivan, and those who shared his faith in the feasibility of a high dam at Grand Coulee, carried the project through crisis after crisis, until today the "right" for which they stood has been recognized by all who are acquainted with developments in the Columbia Basin.

In 1931, the Wenatchee Daily World said: "Two years ago when Mr. O'Sullivan returned to the State of Washington, the Grand Coulee Dam was literally dead and buried. In 2 years' time, with very little money, he has brought the dam within 2 years of construction." In 1935, Life magazine carried an article giving credit for the Columbia Basin project to others, without mentioning the name of James O'Sullivan. Hon. Charles H. Leavy, then Congressman from the State of Washington, rose in the House of Representatives and stated that while much credit was due these other men, James O'Sullivan deserved greatest recognition.

In commenting on this statement by Congressman Leavy, the Seattle Times said: "It does not diminish the credit due others to state that for many years everyone believed that the Pend Oreille gravity system was the only means of irrigating the basin lands—James O'Sullivan thought differently. He led and won the fight for Grand Coulee Dam."

Many men have contributed vision and effort to the promotion and development of Grand Coulee Dam and the Columbia Basin. Outstanding among them, for perseverance in the face of adversity, for faith in his cause is James O'Sullivan. As a tribute to him and for the people who know the saga of the Columbia Basin, I introduce this resolution to designate this structure O'Sullivan Dam.

RESOLUTION OF MOSES LAKE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

"Whereas the name 'Potholes Dam' is sometimes misunderstood outside of the Columbia Basin area; and

"Whereas James O'Sullivan has dedicated his life and worked with untiring energy for the Columbia Basin; and

"Whereas his sacrifices and services should be recognized: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the name 'Potholes Dam' be changed to 'O'Sullivan Dam.'"

The above being approved unanimously at the regular meeting, February 3, 1948, of the Chamber of Commerce of Moses Lake, Wash.

We hereunto set our hand and seal this 3d day of February 1948.

C. BEDFORD,
President.
G. E. DOUGHERTY,
Secretary.

SERVICE CREDIT FOR VETERANS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McGRATH submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1975) to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN EUROPEAN DISPLACED PERSONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McGRATH submitted eight amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. MORSE) submitted six amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2242), supra, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT TO NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a message dated March 15, 1948, from President Truman to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in its thirty-eighth annual convention at Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCLELLAN BEFORE CONVENTION OF NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on March 20, 1948, at the thirty-eighth annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM—ADDRESSES BY DONALD R. RICHBERG AND RAYMOND MOLEY

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two addresses broadcast on March 30, 1948, in a series of programs opposing the President's civil-rights program, the first by Donald R. Richberg, the second by Raymond Moley, which appear in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION TO CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at a meeting of the Loyola College Alumni Association on March 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS BOARDS THE TAX-CUT BAND WAGON—EDITORIAL FROM LOUISVILLE (KY.) COURIER-JOURNAL

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress Boards the Tax-Cut Band Wagon," published in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of March 24, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS IN AMERICA—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "DP's in America; We Have Become Alive," written by Gertrude Samuels and published in the New York Times Magazine of March 28, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PALESTINE ISSUE—STATEMENT BY DR. CHAIM WEIZMANN

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the Palestine issue, released by Dr. Chaim Weizmann, former president of the World Zionist Organization and of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the other day I received a letter from Charles L. Culp, of Elkhart, Ind., which began as follows:

I'm so favorably impressed with your editorial in the Capper's Farmer dated March 1948 pertaining to liquor, wine, and beer advertising that I desire to commend you for it in this limited and humble way.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial referred to which takes a stand against the advertising of intoxicating liquor in newspapers and magazines.

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

LIQUOR ADVERTISING SHOULD BE STOPPED

The people of the United States spent $8,700,000,000 in 1946 for whisky, beer, and wine, according to figures issued by the United States Department of Commerce. That is $89 each for every citizen over 18 years of age. The report further says: "This total was $920,000,000 more than the previous record set in 1945."

Add to that the huge sum of money spent on things that go with drinking; add the cost to the governments of policing the drunks and the crimes, to say nothing of the human wastage and misery, and it is evident the women and children of this country pay a heavy price for the drink habit.

I might add that when I see these billions and billions of dollars going for drink, it seems to me that the billions we are expending for relief of starving people abroad, and the high prices for food, and even the high taxes we are paying—these other billions of expenses don't seem quite so big.

The consumption of alcoholic beverages is increasing steadily. This increase has been accompanied, naturally and logically, by an increase in crime. The liquor industry has been spending between $100,000,000 and $150,000,000 a year in advertising whisky, beer, and wines. This advertising has been a potent factor in stimulating liquor sales and liquor drinking. It has been a serious obstacle to enforcement of the prohibitionary laws in dry territory, because the advertisements can be sent into such territory even though it is illegal to ship in liquor.

In an effort to meet this situation, I have a bill in the Senate that would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages.

My bill makes it unlawful for makers or sellers of alcoholic beverages to cause to be transported in the mail or otherwise, from State to State, newspapers, periodicals, news reels, photographic film, or phonograph records, which advertise alcoholic beverages or solicit an order for them. It carries the same prohibitions against publishers, common carriers, and broadcasting stations.

Here is what Roger W. Babson, famous economist, says about this matter:

"I am thoroughly convinced that the tremendous volume of liquor advertising has increased the amount of intemperance, and the vice, crime, accidents, injuries, damage to industry and property, as well as moral degradation, attributable to drinking of alcoholics. In these perilous times, the need for a sober, morally sound America is paramount to the profits of those who derive revenue from liquor advertising. I heartily endorse the Capper bill and ask that it be enacted."

Glenn Cunningham, a great Kansas athlete, who has a great deal of contact with young people, says that "during the last 15 years I have noticed an alarming increase in the number who use alcoholic beverages. Every person conscious of the startling increase in delinquency among youths, in deaths and injuries from accidents, in murder and rape, in impoverished and broken homes and in the number of mental diseases, realizes the urgent need for the passage by Congress of Senator CAPPER's bill."

There is no way of determining positively the extent to which advertising has contributed toward the alarming increase in liquor drinking and drunkenness. But I cannot believe it is just a coincidence that lineage of liquor advertising and beer and liquor consumption have increased proportionately during the last few years.

I have always been opposed to booze and I always will be. I am proud that my native State, Kansas, is dry. The legislation I propose, in addition to deglamorizing liquor drinking, will help dry States enforce their laws. States cannot regulate this particular kind of advertising effectively. I am convinced that congressional action is needed if anything is to be done about it.

ARTHUR CAPPER.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL BUILDINGS IN WASHINGTON STATE

Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. President, for the past month I have been introducing several bills for the authorization of needed post offices in my State. There has been some disagreement between the junior Senator from my State [Mr. CAIN] and myself on the method of approach to this needed construction. The junior Senator from Washington is chairman of the subcommittee in charge of these projects.

In order to clarify my position in this matter, and to avoid any misunderstanding regarding the purpose of the introduction of these bills, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have sent to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works.

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

MARCH 26, 1948.

The Honorable CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Chairman, United States Senate Committee on Public Works,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR REVERCOMB: This is to acknowledge with thanks receipt of the communication from the clerk of the Committee on Public Works regarding the hearing pending on bills relating to public buildings, including those which I have introduced for certain cities in the State of Washington.

Please consider this letter my response to your gracious invitation to submit a statement before the Subcommittee on Public Buildings.

I also desire to acknowledge receipt of the copies of the adverse reports of the Post Office Department, the Federal Works Agency, and the Bureau of the Budget on my bills.

The essence of the reports is to the effect that the Post Office Department and the Federal Works Agency already have the authority to authorize construction, acquire sites, and erect Federal buildings or enlarge, remodel and extend existing public buildings, including post-office buildings, without procuring consent from Congress (just as long as Congress appropriates a lump sum for such a program and does not tie any strings to the appropriation).

It is also their contention that they have a list of all of the building projects covered by the proposed legislation and the projects will be eligible for funds when money is made available by Congress.

Although chapter 380 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, as amended under the Reorganization Act of 1939, gives the Post Office Department and the Federal Works Agency power to make a selection of desirable sites for post offices after investigation of relative urgency, postal receipts, population, and degree of inadequacy, it modifies this authority to an extent in that the departments must submit a list of projects to Congress and of course must consult Congress on subsequent appropriations for the construction. As a result authorizations are not in fact considered as such until after formal action in Congress and they have been printed in a House document according to information I have from the Federal Works Agency and other sources.

The only other manner then to secure an authorization is through a specific bill naming a certain location as in the case of those in question—which would be considered as directives on the governmental agencies (FWA and Post Office Department) as most-needed projects and would thus have consideration assured when a lump-sum appropriation is given the Federal Works Agency.

I have inspected the deficiency appropriation bill for 1934, House Document No. 788, of Seventy-first Congress, third session, and House Document No. 177, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session (1939, the latest document to be officially published by the House of Representatives authorizing projects in the amounts therein stated) and I have not found authorizations for the following post offices at all: Bellingham, Burlington, Ephrata, Gig Harbor, Moses Lake, Olympia, Poulsbo, Sequim, Silverdale, Vancouver, Vashon.

I have failed to find any authorizations in the amounts proposed in the bills I have introduced, which in my opinion more truly represent the amount of construction necessary to adequately house the facilities needed in each instance than the last figures as adopted in 1939. Inasmuch as there are no statutes to increase the present authorizations on those projects which may have outdated references in laws of 10 years ago, and in most cases limited to specific appropriations long since exhausted, now authority is desirable. Such legislation is not in opposition to the authority of FWA now but runs parallel directing this agency to spend part of the funds that may become available in the future for certain jobs.

The House of Representatives has recognized the advisability of Congress' directing FWA and the Post Office Department to consider specific projects when the next lump-sum appropriation is forthcoming as has the United States Senate. This has resulted in passage of H. R. 4967 and H. R. 4836 concerning Portland and Omaha post office facilities which your committee favorably considered. Representatives of the Federal Works Agency and the Post Office Department personally appeared in the Public Works Committees of Congress in behalf of these two bills. If the legislation is unnecessary in the instance of my bills, it is likewise unnecessary for the House bills just mentioned. Yet, House Reports 1247 and 1249 of the Eightieth Congress, second session, testify to the personal interest of J. E. Betterley, Superintendent of Post Office Quarters, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General Walter Myers, and Commissioner W. E. Reynolds of the Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency, before the House committee. If the authorization is granted already by law, there is no need for further consideration even thought the case is one of emergency. However, if further authorization is necessary, I would bring to your attention two of my bills which are of the most critical nature—S. 1878 for a Terminal Annex at Seattle, Wash., and S. 1880 for a Federal building at Tacoma, Wash., where the departments have given them the routine unfavorable reports handed out to all of the others. Needless to say, passage of the two House bills H. R. 4967 and H. R. 4836 indicates further legislation is necessary.

The procedure of legislation for a specific job is further accented by introduction of an omnibus authorization bill introduced by the chairman of the Public Works Committee of the Senate under S. 1955 and followed by S. 1956, a specific construction job at South Charleston, W. Va., for not to exceed $175,000 which is identical to legislation I have introduced.

If the unnecessary contention is true in the instance of my bills for the reasons stated, it is also true for the two omnibus authorization bills for planning that have been introduced in the House of Representatives and the Senate under S. 1955 and H. R. 5276 as well as these individual bills. The question then appears as to who considers the bills unnecessary—the departments or Members of Congress, and to what degree.

The 1926 Public Buildings Act also contains the further restriction that unless specifically provided for in the act making appropriations for public buildings, no contract for the construction, enlarging, remodeling, or extension of any building or for the purchase of land authorized by that act shall be entered into until moneys in the Treasury shall be made available for the payment of all obligations arising out of such contract.

It might well be that circumstances make it possible to get appropriations for planning at an earlier date than for the actual construction of a job. In such a case, it would first be necessary to get either a special authorization for planning along with the necessity of getting the authorization for further work at a later date through inclusion in a new House document or still another authorization bill for construction.

On the other hand, if one of my bills is picked by your committee to be of sufficient urgency to warrant attention, its passage would permit an appropriation for planning now and another appropriation later for actual construction without further authorization legislation—if it should be apparent that dividing the appropriations into two requests is the most feasible method. The language of the bills is for simple authorizations. There are no qualifying amendments to unduly extend the legislative process.

During the last few years, it has been the policy of the House of Representatives not to appropriate funds for any item that does not have a specific authorization of recent date, not just Federal office buildings, but on all appropriations. One of the rules of the House of Representatives gives one Member

the power to stop legislation which does not have the necessary background.

May I also point out in passing that construction controls on everything except for amusement purposes have been eliminated for some time now. This type of construction could not be construed by any stretch of the imagination as being for amusement purposes and is getting more critical daily. Even controls on amusement construction are being abandoned under the new rent-control legislation.

It should also be brought to your attention that this situation is similar to the authorization for a Federal court building for the District of Columbia which was enacted into law at the first session of this Congress in that it is basic authorization legislation against the day when the Federal building in question can be constructed on a date to be determined by Congress itself in the future.

To the subcommittee, I wish to state that the bills I have introduced are needed projects in the State of Washington and are earnestly desired by their communities. I have introduced the bills because the people of those specific areas desired me to so do. I believe they made their requests without any political consideration prompting them. I do not impugn their motives, their desires, or the needs involved.

It will be your job to decide which of these bills are of sufficient need to receive the same special attention as those which have already passed this Congress. You can give those items you believe most urgent their chance to become actualities.

I am positive there are bills for Washington State included here that should receive your favorable consideration now. There is mute but forceful testimony contained in the many communications I have presented to this committee from those who desire the construction. It is up to the subcommittee to decide whether any of these appeals are to be recognized or not—and to what extent.

Sincerely,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained consent to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate for approximately 10 days, beginning tomorrow, on official business.

Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate from today until the 15th of April.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 472) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation-education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I call attention to the announcement made at the conclusion of the session yesterday, that it is the hope that we may conclude today the consideration of the unfinished business, Senate bill 472. It is expected that two or three amendments will be offered, and it is the hope that the amendments will be presented first, then Senators who desire to speak on the bill may follow after the amendments shall have been disposed of one way or the other.

I ask at this time that Senators please remember this announcement. It is the purpose to endeavor to conclude the consideration of the bill today, even if it shall be necessary to remain in session somewhat late this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

Mr. McMAHON obtained the floor.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is absent because of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent because of serious illness in his family.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a few moments?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, yesterday on the floor of the Senate I made a statement supporting the pending Federal-aid-to-education bill, S. 472. So far as my own State of New Jersey is concerned, this is a very controversial subject, and for the RECORD I should like to state that the Governor of my State, Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, is opposed to the bill. I have had called to my attention a telegram which he sent on March 23 to Mr. Alvin A. Burger, director of research of the National Association of State Chambers of Commerce in Washington, advising Mr. Burger of his attitude on this subject.

In order to make the RECORD complete, so far as my State is concerned, I should like to say that there has been opposition to the bill from various groups, as well as strong support for the bill from other groups. Yesterday I stated the reasons for my own conclusions in the matter, which were fundamentally that the education of our children is a Federal as well as a State responsibility.

To make clear the position of Governor Driscoll, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks his telegram to Mr. Burger, previously referred to, which reads as follows:

MARCH 23, 1948.

Mr. ALVIN A. BURGER,
Director of Research, National Association of State Chambers of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

Reurtel advising me that United States Senate 472 would provide approximately $4,000,000 for Federal aid to New Jersey schools. This program would cost New Jersey taxpayers approximately $11,000,000. New Jersey has consistently taken the position that it wants to do more and more for itself while asking the Federal Government to do less and less for it. We can develop a working federalism with real home rule if the same amount of time and energy that is presently being devoted to the development of increased grants-in-aid with their inevitable bureaucracy were devoted to untangling competing and overlapping Federal-State taxes and returning to the States some of the taxes that have heretofore been taken away, thus permitting the States to handle their own affairs. As you know I have opposed increased grants-in-aid for States. I know of no reason why I should change my position. In my annual message I recommended an additional $10,000,000 in State aid for our local school districts. Our problem now is to find the income to meet this obligation. We had hoped by this time that the Federal Government would have withdrawn from some of its wartime excise taxes and returned a greater portion of the death taxes, permitting us to meet our local obligations without new taxes. If Federal grants-in-aid must be considered, they should be solely upon the basis of proven need.

ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
Governor, State of New Jersey.
STATE HOUSE, *Trenton, N. J.*

I may say, as I stated yesterday, that I am not in accord with the Governor of my State on this question, because I feel that the over-all picture is such that the Federal Government has a responsibility; so I am supporting Senate bill 472.

However, I wish to add that I am in entire accord with the Governor's statement that we should consider a reallocation of sources of tax revenue as between the States and the Federal Gov-

ernment, to the end that our States may assume more and more of their responsibilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senator from Connecticut begins his address, the Chair requests that there be order in the Senate. That applies also to our guests in the galleries. The Chair realizes that these are busy days in Washington, and that the galleries are packed. We are very glad to have all the spectators who are present; but the Chair asks the occupants of the galleries kindly to bear in mind that the Senate has very important business to transact. If the occupants of the galleries will act accordingly, it will be of great help to the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I think perhaps it would be wise for me to make a few observations on some fundamental convictions which I hold with respect to the pending bill and with respect to the amendment which I have suggested.

I want it clearly understood, in order to clear away some of the underbrush—and although it might not be necessary to state it, I will state it for the RECORD—that there is no one in the Senate or in the United States who subscribes more fully and completely than does the Senator from Connecticut to the constitutional provision for the separation of church and state. When I say that I also, of course, say by implication that I accept and give full faith, credit, and authority to the decisions of the Supreme Court which have so lately been handed down on the subject.

I recognize that in the Everson case, the New Jersey case, the Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Black, stated that tax funds could not be used, no matter how small the amount, in order to promote the religious function. It will be recalled that in the Everson case the question was raised as to whether or not payment by the State of New Jersey for bus transportation to nonpublic schools was within the prohibition of the first amendment, as construed in the light of the provision of the fourteenth amendment. In that case the Court said in unmistakable terms that such an incidental furnishing of services not impinging on the religious function was not in violation of the Constitution. In the Champaign case, the McCollum case, so-called, handed down a few weeks ago, the Court decided that religious instruction in public-school buildings could not be permitted, in view of the first amendment.

There are three contentions which have been made with regard to providing in the pending legislation for the nonpublic schools. The first was voted down overwhelmingly yesterday when the amendment presented by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] came to a test. As will be recalled, the amendment of the Senator from Missouri provided that in this legislation we should say that, regardless of the intention, regardless of the desire, regardless of the question of constitutionality under constitutions of the States, no money should be paid under this bill to any State, regardless of its desire in the matter.

The second position is the one which is upheld by the sponsor of the bill, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. His position is that we should leave this matter to the States. The Senator from Ohio points out that under the Supreme Court's decisions, the field in which the Federal Government can help nonpublic schools is a limited one.

As I read the decisions, I believe that field is confined to bus transportation, to health, and recreational services, and, finally, to nonreligious schoolbooks.

The position of the Senator from Ohio is that the States should be allowed to determine whether they should accept money from the Federal Treasury for those purposes for dispensation to the nonpublic school children. The position I advance in the amendment I have filed is briefly this: I have suggested that the 2,500,000 nonpublic school children shall, as a matter of Federal policy, share to the extent of $5,000,000 on the basis of the nonpublic school population in the respective States.

Those are the three positions, Mr. President. There is no use in discussing the first position, the one taken by the Senator from Missouri, for we have disposed of that.

I contend that the position taken by the Senator from Ohio is not correct. First, the Senator from Ohio provides in his bill that each State shall receive from the Federal Treasury on the basis of a census of all children between the ages of 5 and 17 within the State, for the purposes of computing the amount which will go to the State.

The bill as now written includes all nonpublic school children. But when it comes time to dispense the money which is computed on that basis, the proposal of the Senator from Ohio is that we should leave it up to the State to determine whether the money which has been received on a basis of the population of all the children should be dispensed solely to the public-school children, if that is the State's desire.

I was very much interested the other day when the Senator from Ohio had an exchange with the Senator from Missouri, which I should like to call to the attention of the Senate because I think it very well illustrates the error into which my friend, the Senator from Ohio, has fallen. The Senator from Missouri was making the point that his people in Missouri do not permit tax funds, under their State constitution to go to nonpublic schools. He said that he did not concede the right of the Federal Government to take money out of the State of Missouri and hand it to States for dispensation to nonpublic schools, if his people in the State of Missouri refused to do so.

The Senator from Ohio answered that, and I thought very cogently, when he said:

> The Senator pays taxes to the Federal Government as a citizen of the United States, not as a citizen of the State of Missouri. If the policy of the United States is to contribute this money for certain purposes, then it seems to me the Senate is subject to the decision of the United States. Furthermore, on the same theory, I do not like to be taxed for reclamation purposes. We do not have reclamation in Ohio. Therefore I do not think I ought to be taxed for reclamation purposes. I think we must look at the bill as being justified only on the theory that the people of the United States as a whole have an interest in education. Certainly question of where the money is derived or what particular State is involved does not affect the question of taxation.

Mr. President, this proposal has come before the Senate, and undoubtedly will become the law because the Congress of the United States will realize that the general good of the country requires, in fact demands, that we shall not permit ignorance to prevail in broad areas of the Nation.

Our experience in the last draft, in which I believe a million men were rejected because of illiteracy, was a tremendous shock, and it was realized there could be no more valuable asset than the children of the Nation. The Senator from Ohio—and I think it is to his credit—abandoned the position he had theretofore taken and said, "In view of the facts which are now disclosed, I believe it is necessary and imperative that the Federal Government do something about the situation."

Mr. President, there is in this bill great danger, as I see it. We all know that "he who pays the piper can call the tune." I do not think there is a Member of the Senate who wants to see any Federal bureaucracy reaching down and writing the curriculums of the schools, but on the other hand, it must be realized that we cannot permit millions of our children to live out their lives in total ignorance. There are some of us who have come to the conclusion that the only way that can be prevented is for the Federal Government to render assistance to the States in order to raise educational standards and qualifications.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that what made the Senator from Ohio change his mind about this legislation was that he wanted to help the children of the Nation. He did not want to help the States; he wanted to see to it that the children became more literate, and certainly when the committee agreed with him and wrote the statement of the purposes for which the money could be used, namely, for contributions or payments toward current expenditures, the Senator from Ohio and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare provided for the development not only of the minds but of the bodies of the school children of America.

Under the formula set forth in the bill, provision is made for a contribution toward the payment of current expenditures. What are current expenditures? The only limitation on the phrase "current expenditures" is carried in the bill, and the only prohibition is against paying for new construction, for debt reduction, or for interest on the debt. In other words, current expenditures cover everything commonly used in the school systems of the United States.

Mr. President, the school systems are taking care of two things: They are forming the minds of the boys and girls of the Nation, and they are trying to improve their intellectual processes and give them information which will enable

them to become good citizens. But, fortunately for our educational standards, there has been a growing realization that there are many other things which the school systems can do, and are doing, which contribute to the making of good, sound citizens. What are those things? Assistance is given toward improving the health of the children. Examinations are made of the teeth and eyes of the children. If a defect exists, the parents are notified, and if the parents are unable to pay for treatment, the State board of health sees to it that the children receive proper attention. In 65 percent of the schools, I am informed, such attention is given to the children. Moreover, in practically every State bus transportation is furnished, so that the child may go from his home to school and return safely.

There is another thing which has been espoused in the educational system, I think properly. Juvenal's maxim, "mens sana in corpore sano," "A sound mind in a sound body," is as pertinent today as when he uttered it. We have accepted the need of recreational facilities—basketball courts, baseball lots, physical education—all with the idea of rearing children to possess sound minds in sound bodies. As I see it, the Federal policy we are adopting, and which underlies the pending legislation, is the promotion of sound minds in sound bodies for our children. It is a great investment, and it can become a greater investment for the glory of America.

Under the Constitution and under the decisions of the Supreme Court, Congress could not, if it would, devote a single penny of tax money for the purpose of promoting the religious training of the child; but under the same decisions of the Supreme Court it is entirely permissible, as I read them, to cover what I have covered in my amendment, namely, bus transportation, nonreligious school books, as decided in the Cochran case in an opinion written by Chief Justice Hughes in 1930, recreational facilities, and health services.

My amendment proposes that the States, if they so desire, may receive money proportionately for nonpublic schools, to the extent of their proportion of the total of $5,000,000, and that, if the State shall refuse to do so, then the Commissioner of Education shall be certified to by the State having a nonpublic school, for its proportion of the money.

That is an interesting formula, for two reasons. First, it is the formula adopted by Congress in connection with the school-lunch program. In other words, if the State, out of Federal funds, will not pay for the lunches of children in the nonpublic schools, it is provided that the failure may be certified to the Secretary of Agriculture and the money obtained. That became the pattern for the mechanics of the amendment. But I want to call your attention, Mr. President, to the parallel situation that exists, in that the Congress has already recognized—and I contend, rightfully recognized—that no American child should be deprived of a hot lunch merely because he happens to attend a nonpublic school. Nor should we, as a matter of Federal policy, deprive the children of America of recreational facilities, health education, or bus transportation, any more than we deprive them now of the free lunches under the school-lunch program.

I said in an exchange during the debate a few days ago that when and if there shall be another draft and these children are called as they become of age, they will not be asked where they went to school. The examiners will look at their eyes, their teeth, and their bodies, and will take them or reject them, depending upon their physical fitness.

The authority for the expenditures on which the bill rests, as was argued yesterday, certainly can be well laid on the provision of the Constitution which provides that the Congress can expend money for the common defense. We should be neglecting an opportunity to fulfill our duty to make a contribution to the common defense if we should cut off the benefits which constitutionally can be given to 2,500,000 children in this Nation. I believe that the people of America, if they really and truly understood the problem, would not approve of depriving them of such benefits. We must remember that in the case of Pierce against Oregon, decided by the Supreme Court many years ago, it was held by that court that attendance at a nonpublic school, an approved school, was a full and complete compliance with the provision of the State statute of Oregon requiring every child to attend a school—a "public school," the statute was worded. The Supreme Court rightfully said that while the State had rights, they were subject to the rights of the parents when it came to choosing a place at which their children should be educated.

The little ones who are in the nonpublic schools are not there of their own choice. In 99 cases out of 100 they are there because their parents have sent them there, and, under the law, they are entitled to attend those schools. Not on the basis of doing any favor to the State—that entity which has no soul—but on the basis of taking care of the little ones of this country, I say that Congress should not refuse to appropriate at least a small amount of money to discharge its duty to those of two and a half million children.

A few days ago, Mr. President, I had occasion to ascertain what it was costing the parents of two and a half million children to maintain their separate school systems. There are included Seventh-Day Adventists, Lutherans, and Roman Catholics. I found this astounding fact, that the educational bill, based upon the average of $125 for each child in the common-school system of America, amounts to $312,000,000 a year. I also found that the physical plant of the nonpublic schools is appraised at more than $1,000,000,000. So certainly the taxpayers of America cannot cavil, find fault, and be distressed about bearing their proportion of the cost of the public-school system, which I cannot reiterate too strongly I support with all my heart.

I graduated from the public schools of my home town. I have two sisters teaching in the high schools there at this time. I would resist, with every bit of strength I have, any effort to impair the school system which has contributed so largely to making America great; but I also say that we should not, because there are persons in this country who hold the conviction that knowledge of the word of God is of first and primary importance in the education of a child, penalize the parents and penalize the children.

So, Mr. President, for the good of the children of the United States who fall within this classification, for the good of the common defense, because we should fulfill our duty, as I see it, to the limit which the Constitution and the decisions of the Supreme Court have allowed us to do, I say that my amendment providing for $5,000,000 should be voted into the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] for a division on the amendment offered by him.

Mr. CHAVEZ. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. After a request for a division, is it in order to ask for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order to ask for the yeas and nays before the division, but not after the result of the division is announced.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I spoke briefly on this amendment last night. I pointed out that just as I opposed the

amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], which sought to provide that even in a State where these rather minor services were furnished to parochial-school children there should be no Federal money given, so I also oppose the pending amendment, which provides that even in a State which is opposed to the policy, where its constitution may forbid it, where its laws forbid it, nevertheless, these services must be given by the State through use of Federal money. I think in this case also we should oppose the amendment.

It seems to me the only safe view for us to take in a case where the Federal interest is purely secondary, where the primary obligation of education rests upon the State, and where the Federal Government only affords secondary aid because of the lack of finances of the State, is that we must, if we are going to maintain our system, leave the control of the educational system in the hands of each State. That is the principle of section 2 of the bill. I do not think we should in any way attempt in granting Federal money to force upon a State an educational system or any detail of an educational system or any incidentals to an educational system which are opposed to the policy of the State as shown by its own laws and its own constitution. On that ground I believe very strongly that if we intend to adhere to the sound principle of aid to States, the principle upon which I think Federal aid to States can be justified, the pending amendment should be rejected, as the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri was rejected.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Is there anything in the amendment that makes it compulsory on the States to utilize the funds appropriated for the purposes suggested in the amendment?

Mr. TAFT. It is provided that the money must be distributed——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to answer that question?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator from Louisiana that the amendment was modeled, as I stated in my previous remarks, on the school-lunch program. In other words, if the State wants to take the money for the limited purposes for which the amendment provides it is free to do so. For the limited purposes of my amendment, if the State does not want to disburse the money through its own machinery, then the school can apply to the State educational commissioner, as the nonpublic school applies to the Secretary of Agriculture in the school-lunch program, and receive up to 60 percent of the amount it has spent for these certain limited objectives.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to read the provision of the amendment:

If in any State the State educational authority is not permitted by law to disburse the funds paid to it under this title to nonpublic tax-exempt schools in the State, the Secretary shall withhold the funds apportioned to any such State, said funds to be disbursed by the Secretary directly to such nonpublic tax-exempt schools.

So it is a direct interference with the whole theory of leaving to the States the determination of their own educational system.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I had voted on the voice vote in favor of the amendment because I understood it in no sense imposed any regulations upon the conduct of the schools in the different States; but I have come to a contrary view after listening to the Senator from Ohio and to the author of the amendment. Therefore, Mr. President, I expect to vote against the amendment. I am opposed to any regulation imposed directly or indirectly by the Federal Government upon the administration of the public-school system or education in the various States.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio a question, if he will permit me. Does he take the same view of the school-lunch program for non-public-school children as he has taken on this amendment?

Mr. TAFT. No; I have no objection whatever in all health matters for the State to deal directly with children, with no relation in any way to where they are. This is a proposal to aid the States in their educational system, and as we know, the Constitution practically forbids any aid to parochial schools in their educational system. Incidental services in some cases are permitted.

Where the States permit State aid to be given sectarian schools, that is where it is part of their educational system, I think the Federal money ought to be used for that purpose. That is why I voted against the Donnell amendment. But where the State policy forbids aid, where the State has chosen to say, "No, we think that if a child wants to take advantage of the educational system he must go to the public school, and we offer him free the equal education in the public school," then I do not think the Federal Government ought to step in and say, "We disapprove of that policy, and insist on Federal funds going where a State does not permit its funds to go.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator realize that the argument he has just made would destroy the school-lunch program for non-public-school children?

Mr. TAFT. No; it would do nothing of the kind. In the first place, there is a complete educational system which is built up in every State. Every State offers an education free to every child in the State. That is the basis of our public-school system.

In the case of health, more than half of the public-health services are private, and always have been so. When we passed the so-called hospital bill we found there was no general public-health service offered in the States. The system was built up on the basis of all kinds of private hospitals. We offered direct health service to all kinds of private hospitals.

In the first place, the religious question, the constitutional question, is in no way involved in health matters. And in the second place, the fact is that all health systems throughout the country have been built up largely on a private basis, and no State has ever undertaken, up to this time, so far as I know, to offer any universal health service to anybody.

We have a health bill under consideration in the committee. In that bill it is provided that where Federal aid is given to the States to provide for the inspection of the health of school children, their teeth, and so forth, it may be a general inspection. It may be held in the child's home, it may be held in the public school, it may be held in the parochial school, it may be held anywhere. It is merely a part of a general health system. The State may, if it wants to, say, "We will not have it done in the schools. The children must go to some particular hospital where the inspection can be made." The place where it is done is not important. It has nothing to do with education. Personally I think that with respect to health inspection it should be in no way limited. I do not see how the health question is affected by the whole public-school question.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief comment on the argument made by the Senator from Ohio. We are appropriating money under this bill for the payment of current expenditures, and current expenditures, under the bill, mean payment for all children in public schools, payment in aid of teachers' salaries, in aid of health programs, in aid of education, and bus transportation. The Senator from Ohio may think that he can distinguish between giving a bottle of milk at 12 o'clock noon to a child, and looking at his teeth and his eyes at 3 o'clock, but he cannot make that distinction clear to me.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. I have the floor. I shall yield in a minute. I reiterate that the Federal policy behind this whole proposal is to help the children of this country. It is not to help the States. It is not to help the school systems per se. It is to help the children. It is to help the children who are in private nonparochial schools and nonsectarian schools in Vermont. That is what we ought to be doing, and that is what the Constitution and the Supreme Court decisions permit us to do.

As I pointed out before, when young men are called up for the draft they are not going to be asked where they went to school or what their religion is. The authorities are going to examine their teeth, and their eyes, and their bodies. That is the kind of thing we are doing for the public-school systems, and rightfully so. That is what we ought to do, as I have provided in this amendment.

Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] that in order to remove the objection which he has advanced to the amendment as I have drawn it, I will insert in the amendment

on page 5, line 3, after the word "law" the words "nor does it elect", so as to read:

Provided, however, That if in any State the State educational authority is not permitted by law nor does it elect to disburse the funds paid to it under this title to nonpublic tax-exempt schools in the States, the Secretary shall withhold—

And so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator's amendment will be so modified.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to express sympathy with the purposes of the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut. I have always believed, and I now believe, that there are certain services which should be given to every child, regardless of where he or she may attend school. During the weeks when the bill was under consideration by the committee I did the best I could to see that provision for such services was included in the bill.

There was the argument that no money should be permitted to be expended for services for children attending private schools, either parochial or other private schools. The committee finally decided upon the provisions of Senate bill 472, which leaves the matter up to each State. The bill does not go as far as I would have gone, but I am satisfied that in the bill we have obtained the maximum possible values, with the end in view of providing a minimum education for all children in this country.

I have the feeling that the adoption even of meritorious amendments might jeopardize the enactment of this legislation. If we cannot get these services for all the children in all the States, I would rather get what benefits we can for as many children as possible, and in as many States as will permit such benefits to be extended. Therefore I do not believe we should adopt any amendments which would jeopardize final enactment of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay a vote on the amendment. However, I feel that I should call attention to the fact that 38 of the 48 States of the Union have provisions in their constitutions which expressly prohibit the State governments from granting any aid or any diversion or division of State funds in any way or manner to any school other than a free public school. I shall not delay the vote, but I should like to have unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a list of the 38 States to which I refer, showing the dates when the constitutional provisions were placed in the constitutions of the respective States.

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

STATES AMENDING CONSTITUTION

New Jersey, 1844; Michigan, 1850; Ohio, 1851; Indiana, 1851; Massachusetts, 1855; Iowa, 1857; Mississippi, 1868; South Carolina, 1868; Arkansas, 1868; Illinois, 1870; Pennsylvania, 1872; West Virginia, 1872; Alabama, 1875; Missouri, 1875; North Carolina, 1876; Texas, 1876; Minnesota, 1877; Georgia, 1877; California, 1879; Louisiana, 1879; Florida, 1885; Delaware, 1897.

ADOPTED WHEN ADMITTED

Wisconsin, 1848; Oregon, 1857; Kansas, 1859; Nevada, 1864; Nebraska, 1867; Colorado, 1876; North Dakota, 1889; South Dakota, 1889; Montana, 1889; Washington, 1889; Idaho, 1890; Wyoming, 1890; Utah, 1896; Oklahoma, 1907; New Mexico, 1912; Arizona, 1912.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. O'DANIEL] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent because of serious illness in his family.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 66, as follows:

YEAS—14

Baldwin	Lodge	Magnuson
Chavez	McCarran	Myers
Downey	McCarthy	O'Conor
Ives	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Johnson, Colo.	McMahon	

NAYS—66

Aiken	George	Malone
Ball	Green	Maybank
Barkley	Gurney	Millikin
Bricker	Hatch	Moore
Buck	Hawkes	Morse
Byrd	Hayden	Overton
Cain	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Capehart	Hill	Reed
Capper	Hoey	Revercomb
Cooper	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Cordon	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Dworshak	Kem	Saltonstall
Eastland	Knowland	Smith
Ecton	Langer	Sparkman
Ellender	Lucas	Stennis
Ferguson	McClellan	Stewart
Flanders	McFarland	Taft
Fulbright	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Thye	Vandenberg	Williams
Tobey	Watkins	Wilson
Umstead	Wherry	Young

NOT VOTING—16

Brewster	Kilgore	Tydings
Bridges	Martin	Wagner
Brooks	Murray	White
Bushfield	O'Daniel	Wiley
Butler	O'Mahoney	
Connally	Taylor	

So Mr. McMAHON'S amendment, as modified, was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and further insists on its amendment to the title of the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. EATON, Mr. VORYS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BLOOM, and Mr. KEE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ARE OUR COLLEGES BEING SOCIALIZED?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address delivered by R. D. Cole, president of Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa. Being one of those interested in educational institutions, I may say that I have gained much from reading this address. As is usual when he discusses a subject, President Cole has struck right at the heart of Federal aid to education.

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

In my opinion, the present proposals for Federal aid to higher education contain two recommendations which should not be enacted into law. These proposals are: first, to appropriate Federal funds for current educational expense and, second, to use Federal money for building and plant expansion in publically controlled institutions of higher education.

The enactment of such recommendations into law would, in my opinion, be unfortunate and certainly detrimental to higher education in this country. The bill of rights debars private and church-related schools, even though they render a public service, from accepting Government support. That is as it should be. Even if all institutions could be included, I would be of the same mind.

Our American culture is unique in that we seek to keep close to the people the determination of goals, of decisions, and of action. The American people have always assumed, generously and wholeheartedly, their responsibilities for higher education. We have provided unexcelled educational opportunities for our youth—but always on the sound principle of local and State or private control and support.

When this concept has been challenged, it has been with a luring program of grants of public moneys from the Federal Treasury which would entail Federal regulations, Federal inspection, Federal reports, and Federal uniformities. In short, the Federal Gov-

ernment soon would begin to interfere with and then to run our colleges. Such proposals always have been and always should be emphatically rejected.

I have no disagreement with much which is recommended by the President's Commission on Higher Education. The program of Federal scholarships and fellowships for youth of ability and of special talent will win hearty approval everywhere. Likewise, all will agree that contracts for specific purposes should carry direction and supervision. Furthermore, I recognize that the unevenness of higher education, the predicted larger enrollments in the years ahead, and the shortage of teaching personnel constitute major problems. It is a different matter, however, when it is proposed to solve these problems by Federal subsidy of budgets and of plant.

Why do I say this? In the first place, it is inescapable that eventually the sources of support become the sources of control. The Commission recognizes this fact. It acknowledges that the acceptance of public funds by any institution, public or private, carries with it the acceptance of the right of the people to exercise review and control of the educational policies and procedures. It plainly states that the Federal Government has an interest in "those outcomes of education vital to national interests." It recommends that adequate safeguards must be established "to assure full realization of the purposes for which the aid is granted." The only conclusion one can draw is that decisions soon would be made at the Federal level. Certainly the experience of the past few years has demonstrated that Federal grants carry Federal control and Federal uniformities. So, when it is asserted that an exception will be made in the case of higher education, I am little impressed with the assertion. We need keep clearly in mind that all of our freedoms depend on the freedom of education. We can, in my opinion, best maintain that freedom when both the support and the control of education is left the function of the several States. True this may leave some unevenness, but it serves the larger good.

Furthermore, the Commission states that privately controlled institutions should not accept public funds because such acceptance "would tend to destroy the competitive advantage and free inquiry which they have established and which are so important in providing certain safeguards to freedom." I fail to see why this warning does not apply as well to public institutions, and if there is a disposition of funds at the Federal level, the effect on free inquiry then would be national in scope.

The financing of the proposed subsidies, totaling millions of dollars, can only be done by increasing Federal taxes. This will tend to further dry up the sources of support for private institutions, thus making higher education more than ever dependent on the Federal Government. It is only in light of this that I can understand the Commission's position that the enrollment of private colleges will be frozen at present numbers and there will be no further growth. The result, of course, will be that proportionally a less and less number of our youth will enjoy the higher good of free inquiry which is conceded by the President's Commission to be of value as a safeguard to freedom itself.

As I see it, what we do not need in higher education is just what the Commission recommends and acknowledges, namely—Federal support and domination. I believe the best interests of this country are served when there is a strong system of both private and public education in such balances that neither will dominate and both will be strong, with the support and the control always close to the people, that is, vested in the several States.

In light of these facts, it is my opinion that the enactment of these two recommendations of the proposed program of Federal aid will give us less freedom and more control, less free inquiry and more direction, and a system of higher education less expressive of the American genius.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

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

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, in line 17, after the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the following:

(h) provide for the teaching in the public elementary and public secondary schools within such State, and in all other schools within such State to or for the benefit of which funds appropriated pursuant to this act are disbursed, of regular courses of instruction in the text and interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, consisting of not less than 2 hours of classroom instruction during each 4-week period within the school year, in each grade or year above the fifth (excluding kindergarten).

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, there are many reasons why this amendment should be adopted and made a part of the bill dealing with Federal aid to education.

Before I start to talk directly to the amendment, I wish to acquaint my colleagues with an experience that came to me a year or so ago when I contacted a fine American citizen by the name of Carl Gubisch. I may say, Mr. President, that I am still sufficiently interested in the Constitution of the United States to wish to hear what is said about it.

Mr. Gubisch is a veteran of World War I. He not only wore a uniform, but carried it into battle at the front, and was seriously wounded in the battle of the Argonne in France, while serving in the Three Hundred and Sixteenth Infantry, Seventy-ninth Division. Notwithstanding the fact that he was injured in that battle and carries with him an 80-percent disability through life, he has as fine a conception of why he fought and what he fought for as does any man I have ever met.

In talking with Mr. Gubisch, I learned that he has what might almost be called an obsession, a keen regard, for the importance of the Constitution of the United States and the vital necessity for every American citizen to know how it came into existence, its meaning, and the tremendous importance of preserving it in spirit as well as in letter.

I asked Mr. Gubisch how long his family had lived in the United States, and he informed me that he had been born in the United States. He then went on to explain to me why he has such reverence and respect for the Constitution of the United States. He told me a story that every citizen of the United States should know and understand. He said that his mother came to this country alone, at the age of 17 years, having left relatives, friends, and associates in what now is known as Czechoslovakia, in order that she might come to the United States—even though it was a land where she knew no one. Even though she was without finances to depend upon for her existence, she came to start life anew under the American flag. She arrived in the United States in the year 1888. She is still living, and still loves the American flag and reveres the Constitution of the United States, the freedom and liberty and the opportunity which the United States gives to all citizens who will pay the price of success.

Carl Gubisch told me that when he grew to manhood, he continued to talk with his mother about why she took that bold step and left her native land, her relatives, friends, and associates, to come to a new country—to almost a new world, for her—to make a living and get along under the new system. She told her son that there was only one answer, and that answer is the word "freedom"—freedom which was not enjoyed by her or any of her people in Czechoslovakia, the country of her birth, which formerly was known as Bohemia. Carl and his mother talked about what gave people here this freedom, while a large part of the world seems to be without it. They decided that it is the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees to all of our citizens the four freedoms, and under which justice is supposed to be administered on the same basis to high and low, rich and poor, alike.

Mr. Gubisch, notwithstanding his disability from the war, is working every day as one of Washington's prominent businessmen. He has the kind of courage and stamina which our forefathers possessed when they created this country.

He recognizes that no document can be any greater in its effectiveness than the morals and character of the people living under it, make and keep it. He realizes that the people cannot be expected to do the things necessary to preserve and enforce our great Constitution of the United States unless they know the story of its birth and the meaning of its words.

To him the Constitution is almost as sacred as the Ten Commandments, because each defines a way of life. Somehow or other, our forefathers implanted in the Constitution the essence of the Ten Commandments, because they were God-fearing men and they recognized the frailties of the human being, as well as the necessity for guidance from Almighty God.

Mr. Gubisch has spent almost 15 years preparing a book in simple form, in the hope that some day it might tell to the people of the United States the things he has learned about the Constitution and its importance in every act of our daily life. His work on this is a nonprofit work.

Carl Gubisch's mother—a foreign-born individual who came to this country to get away from oppression, and to find a land of liberty—still loves and reveres the Constitution and the rights and privileges and liberties which our great country has given her.

This story that Carl Gubisch and his mother have given to me is as much responsible as any other one thing for my offering this amendment.

I doubt that most of us who have been born here in the United States, and take liberty and freedom so much for granted, could possibly appreciate the importance of the Constitution of the United States as much as do those who came here after having lived under oppression, and then were granted the privilege of freedom as established and practiced in the United States of America.

Mr. Gubisch joins me in the hope that some day the Constitution of the United States will be taught in simple, understandable language to all our children, from the time they are 10 years or 12 years of age up to and through manhood and womanhood.

It is my hope that our beloved country will have many millions of Americans who before long will develop the same understanding and conviction as to the value of our Constitution and the necessity for preserving it as has my friend Carl Gubisch.

First, Mr. President, I believe if the Constitution of the United States and its value in preserving our American way of life were understood by all our young men and women, and the older ones, there would be much more chance of preserving the American system of free men than there is in the way we are drifting.

Second, I am advised that 43 States have made some kind of an effort to require the teaching of the Constitution but under varying conditions, and starting at different times in the life of their students.

The purpose of this amendment is to establish the fact that the Constitution must be taught, in whatever way the State itself deems advisable, for a period of 2 hours every 4 weeks during the school year.

If we want to save America, our citizens must know more about our Constitution, the cause of its coming into being; its effect on the freedom of our people and the great development which has taken place in this Nation.

Third, the churches, to which I call attention, all teach the youth their creeds and doctrines which are the foundation of their religious belief. They teach the children almost from infancy. "Just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined."

Fourth, while we are failing to teach our youth and grown-ups, to a large extent, the fundamental things which are of great importance to our country, the Communists are running rampant throughout our Nation, holding meetings in all our larger cities, night after night, for the purpose of undermining our form of government and our way of life.

I might say, Mr. President, that this great body, the Senate of the United States, has been debating for a long time the spending of billions of dollars. We have just voted those billions of dollars in an effort to stop communism from forcing its will upon the free peoples of the world, and it seems very odd to me that in doing so we do not pay a little more attention to what is going on within our own borders. I say to you, Mr. President, that unless we do, in my opinion, we will someday wake up to find ourselves just as impotent to stop the destruction of our system of government and life as other free peoples throughout the world have found themselves because of their neglect.

As I have said, we are appropriating billions of dollars to stop the advance of communism all over the world, while at the same time we are overlooking a most important right and duty to fight it in the United States, namely, to instill in our youth a greater understanding of our Constitution and its guaranties.

I desire to give an illustration of the freedom which we in this country allow Communists and their fellow travelers. I refer to the case of Langston Hughes. His name will be found in congressional reports by the Un-American Activities Committee. I shall read a few things to show what is going on in the United States.

I want here to record the fact that I went to a church—not my own church, to be sure, but another—in my home town of Montclair. I was amazed to see a Communist stand up in the pulpit and to hear him, without ever making a reference to the life of Christ or to the fact that we have a Bible, berate the United States, tear it down for 55 minutes, and eulogize Russia. I do not believe many of us know very much about what is going on here at home. I shall read two poems written by the Communist of whom I speak, Langston Hughes, who is reported to have gone to Russia and taken a 2 years' training in communism, following which he returned to this country, where he is preaching in the pulpits, talking to students in our high schools, and speaking to college groups at high rates of pay for any speaker. Unless he was stopped, he made a speech at a great college in California last night, March 31, undoubtedly berating the American way and preaching the same doctrine of the destruction of our system that I heard him preach when he was in Montclair. I want to read two poems written by Hughes. The first poem is as follows:

ONE MORE S IN THE U. S. A.

(Written by Langston Hughes, member of the CIO Political Action Committee, for the eighth convention of the Communist Party, U. S. A.)

Put one more S in the U. S. A.
To make it Soviet.
One more S in the U. S. A.
Oh, we'll live to see it yet.
When the land belongs to the farmers
And the factories belong to the workingmen—
The U. S. A. when we take control
Will be the U. S. S. A. then.

Now across the water in Russia
They have a big U. S. S. R.
The Fatherland of the Soviets,
But that is mighty far
From New York or Texas or California, too,
So listen fellow workers,
This is what we have to do.

Put one more S in the U. S. A.
(Repeat chorus.)

But we can't win out by just talking,
So let us take things in our hand.
Then down and 'way with the bosses' sway—
Hail Communist land!
So stand up in battle and wave our flag on high,
And shout out, fellow workers,
Our new slogan to the sky.

(Repeat chorus.)

But we can't join hands strong together
So long as whites are lynching black,
So black and white in one union fight
And get on the right track.
By Texas, or Georgia, or Alabama led,
Come together, fellow workers,
Black and white can all be Red!

(Repeat chorus.)

The poem is reported to have been published in the New York Sunday Mirror, October 8, 1944, at page 22.

I shall now read another poem, which shows what is going on in the United States, while we are busy in Congress trying to equalize all things in justice to all our people. This poem is by the same gentleman, Mr. Langston Hughes. It reads as follows:

Listen, Christ,
You did all-right in your day, I reckon—
But that day's gone now.
They ghosted you up a swell story, too,
Called it Bible—
But it's dead now.
The popes and the preachers, too,
Made too much money from it.
They've sold you to too many.

Kings, generals, robbers, and killers—
Even to the Czar and the cossacks,
Even to Rockefeller's church,
Even to the Saturday Evening Post.
You ain't no good no more;
They've pawned you
Till you've done wore out.

Good-by,
Christ Jesus, Lord, God Jehovah,
Beat it on away from here now.
Make way for a new guy with no religion at all—
A real guy named
Marx Communist, Lenin Peasant, Stalin Worker, Me—
I said, Me!

Go ahead on now,
You're getting in the way of things, Lord.
And please take St. Ghandi with you when you go.
And St. Pope Pius,
And St. Aimee McPherson,
And big black St. Becton of the consecrated dime.
And step on the gas, Christ!
Move!
Don't be so slow about movin'!
The world is mine from now on—
And nobody's gonna sell me
To a king, or a general,
Or a millionaire.

—*Langston Hughes.*

Mr. President, before I proceed, I ask permission to have inserted at this point in my remarks, without taking the time of the Senate to read it, the list of the communistic and fellow-traveler organizations and magazines with which Mr. Langston Hughes is reported to be connected. I wish to have the list published at this point, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Is there objection?

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

LANGSTON HUGHES

American League Against War and Fascism; member, national executive committee; letterhead, August 22, 1935.

American Peace Mobilization; member, national council; Daily Worker, September 8, 1940, page 4.

Champion; contributor; Champion, May 1938, page 14.

Committee of Professional Groups for Browder and Ford; member; letterhead, September 22, 1936.

Communist Party; signer of call for support of Communist Party national elections and its candidates; Daily Worker, September 14, 1932, page 1.

Conference on Pan-American Democracy; signer of call; news release, November 15, 1938, page 3.

Congress of American Revolutionary Writers; signer of call; Daily Worker, January 18, 1935, page 5.

Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo; representative individual; booklet, These Americans Say, page 9.

Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade; sponsor; letterhead, September 10, 1938.

Friends of the Soviet Union; member, editorial council; Soviet Russia Today, August 1937, page 1.

International Workers Order; contributor, new order; New Order, June 1936, page 8.

International Workers Order; speaker; Daily Worker, March 1, 1938, page 2.

Labor; contributing editor; Labor Defender, October 1936, page 3.

League of American Writers, vice president; letterhead, December 29, 1938.

League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford; member; booklet, Culture and the Crises, page 32.

League of Workers, Theatres; contributing editor, New Theatre, New Theatre, September 1934, page 4.

Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy; member, writers and artists committee; letterhead, July 6, 1938; speaker; Daily Worker, March 15, 1938, page 10.

Midwest Daily Record; sent congratulations; Daily Worker, February 15, 1938, page 5.

National Committee to Aid Victims of German Fascism; supporter; letterhead, July 3, 1934.

National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners; member; letterhead, October 31, 1935.

National Committee for People's Rights; member; letterhead, July 13, 1938.

National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.; sponsor; pamphlet, Call to the Congress, November 6–8, 1943, page 4.

National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights; signer of open letter; Daily Worker, May 13, 1940, page 1.

National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; signer of message to the House of Representatives; undated leaflet.

Negro Cultural Committee; member; Daily Worker, April 13, 1938, page 7.

Negro Playwrights Co., Inc.; member and associate; Sunday Worker, September 15, 1940, page 7.

New Masses; frequent contributor from 1928 to 1944.

New Pioneer; contributor; New Pioneer, February 1937, page 9.

New Theatre League; guest, author of play; Daily Worker, June 10, 1938, page 7.

Nonpartisan Committee for the reelection of Congressman VITO MARCANTONIO; member; letterhead, October 3, 1936.

Non-Sectarian Committee for Political Refugees, International Labor Defense; sent greetings to ILD; Equal Justice, June 1939, page 3.

Philadelphia Peoples Forum; speaker; pamphlet, Philadelphia Workers School, winter term 1940, page 3.

Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee; signer, declaration honoring Dimitrov; New York Times, December 22, 1943, page 40.

Soviet Russia Today; contributor; December 1935, page 9.

Statement by American Progressives on the Moscow Trials; signer; Daily Worker, April 28, 1938, page 4.

Sunday Worker; contributor; Daily Worker, December 21, 1935, page 3.

Third American Writers' Congress; speaker; Program of the Congress.

Workers Cultural Federation; member of honorary presidium; New Masses, July 1931, page 13.

Workers Library Publishers; author listed in catalog; 1938 catalog, page 46.

Workers Monthly; contributor; Workers Monthly, March 1925, page 234.

School for Democracy; guest lecturer; catalog.

American Student Union; member, sponsoring committee; leaflet, 1937.

All-American Anti-Imperialist League; signer of statement; news release, 1932.

American Youth for Democracy (formerly the Young Communist League); national sponsor; Spotlight, April 1944, page 19.

There appeared a write-up about Langston Hughes in the Daily Worker, December 6, 1938, page 7.

The following are citations from the Dies committee hearings: Pages 252, 375, 379, 518, 539f, 547, 561, 569, 579, 624ff, 1366, 1585, 1594, 2177, 3008, 4928, 7729; App. vol. 10, page XXVII; 1939 House Report, page 45; Appendix I, page 809; appendix V, page 1680ff.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, while I realize that there are those who claim this amendment, if adopted, will be the first step in the control of education in the States by the Federal Government, nevertheless I ask each Senator to consider the teaching of the Constitution to the youth of our Nation as one subject for which an exception most properly should be made.

Surely all who oppose Federal direction of education within the States can well afford to consider carefully the purpose of this amendment.

If we wish to preserve the Constitution of the United States, it stands to reason that the citizens must know its importance and the value of preserving it.

If this bill shall pass, and the Federal Government shall embark upon the financing of education in the States, then I ask those in the States and their representatives in the Senate if it is not well to have the citizens understand the Constitution. An understanding of the Constitution is surely a basic purpose of the sponsors of this bill.

I for one would far rather relinquish certain taxing areas to the States and have the States accept their own responsibility to provide educational facilities for their own citizens. However, if the majority in the Congress favors a bill such as is proposed here, then they should favor the teaching of the Constitution in the schools of States which receive benefits from the funds provided by the Federal Government under this bill.

If the citizens of the States do not understand the Constitution and preserve it, the Federal Government may lose the taxing power which it has to gather funds into the Federal Treasury from one State and distribute some of those funds in another State for the welfare of the Nation.

It is only because of this power to tax and distribute for the welfare of the Nation that the funds are available; and if the Constitution falls because of ignorance and failure to understand it the power to provide these funds may cease with it.

Mr. President, when I say "if the Constitution falls," I mean that the Constitution can fall in more than one way. It can be totally destroyed, or, as Mr. Charles Evans Hughes once said, the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is. If we have the kind of a Supreme Court which destroys the meaning and effect of the Constitution, the Constitution will have fallen without our knowing it.

To me it seems incredible that the Congress, in providing a bill for Federal aid to education, should hesitate to make it a prerequisite for the States receiving the funds to agree to teach the Constitution in the schools benefiting from such funds to the extent of 2 hours in every 4 weeks during the school year.

Mr. President, I hope my amendment will be agreed to, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], on which the yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second? Apparently there is not.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HAWKES. Does the Chair say that there is not a sufficient number?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixteen are required, based on the last roll call.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have every sympathy with the purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, which would require that in regular courses of instruction in schools the Constitution shall be studied in every classroom. Certainly I hope very much that every school will do that. I think they should go further. I think there should be taught in the schools of the United States a much more extensive course in American history, because it is impossible to understand the Constitution without a complete study of American history. But, Mr. President, the amendment violates every principle of the bill which I have tried to state. It violates the principle of section 2 of the bill, which provides that there shall be no Federal interference in any way in courses of instruction. If we instruct the States to have the Constitution taught in their schools, there is no reason why we should not go further and say they shall teach history, specify the kind of history, and how it shall be taught. There is no possible stopping point, so far as I can see, of the interference which might then be imposed, through Federal action, on the educational systems of the States.

The entire bill is based, as I have said before, on the theory that we are assuming a secondary obligation to see to it that every State is able to give every child a minimum of education. We are trying to reconcile the necessity for each child to secure such an education with the principle of home rule of schools and noninterference. If Congress should attempt to interfere in the actual courses taught in the schools, I should be opposed to the whole bill, because it seems to me it then would be inevitably opening the door to the control by the Federal Government of all education. Consequently, Mr. President, I very much hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I dislike very much to differ with my distinguished friend the Senator from Ohio, whom I consider one of the ablest men in the United States, but it seems to me that there is something fundamental in this proposal which would well justify an exception to the rule. If the Constitution of the United States, the underlying document of our whole Nation, the foundation upon which our school system and all our other liberties are laid——

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

Mr. HAWKES. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise to support the position which the Senator from New Jersey is taking, because it seems to me that the Constitution of the United States guarantees to every State a republican form of government, in the broad sense of that term. Therefore it seems to me it is perfectly appropriate to attach to a grant of Federal funds a provision that the schools to which the funds shall go shall teach the Constitution of the United States which guarantees a republican form of government. I believe the Senator from New Jersey is absolutely right, and I see nothing inconsistent in his amendment or anything which impinges upon local control of schools. It seems to me it is a perfectly proper and natural requirement to put into the proposed legislation.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. I might say it was well worth while having him interrupt me to say what he has said. I appreciate it very much. The Senator from Connecticut was not present, I believe, when I presented the subject in the beginning.

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes; I was present when the Senator read the poems.

Mr. HAWKES. Before I read the poems I had said things along the same line as the thought which the Senator has just expressed. I say again that we ought to be able to make an exception in connection with the underlying document of the Government of the United States, the thing which has made our country what it is. It is just too bad if we have reached the point where the Federal Government is giving hundreds of millions of dollars to the States and using the taxing power of the Constitution to collect the money, and yet we cannot have the Constitution definitely taught in all public and private schools in the States which participate in the funds granted by the Federal Government for educational purposes.

Mr. President, I am sorry there are so few Members of the Senate present—not more than 25. Some are eating lunch and others are attending committee meetings. I think if they would give as much thought to this important subject as I have given to it they would find they could make an exception without opening the floodgates to all other amendments offered.

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	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Brooks	Holland	Reed
Buck	Ives	Revercomb
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capper	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Knowland	Smith
Cooper	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Donnell	Lucas	Stewart
Downey	McCarran	Taft
Dworshak	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McFarland	Thye
Ecton	McGrath	Umstead
Ellender	McKellar	Watkins
Ferguson	McMahon	Wherry
Flanders	Magnuson	Williams
Fulbright	Maybank	Wilson
Green	Millikin	Young
Gurney	Moore	
Hatch	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES].

Mr. HAWKES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official committee business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are detained on official business in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent because of serious illness in his family.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 62, as follows:

YEAS—14

Baldwin	Byrd	McCarran
Bricker	Capehart	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hawkes	Wherry
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Williams
Buck	Langer	

NAYS—62

Aiken	Hoey	O'Conor
Barkley	Holland	Overton
Cain	Ives	Pepper
Capper	Jenner	Reed
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Cordon	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Donnell	Knowland	Russell
Downey	Lodge	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Lucas	Smith
Eastland	McClellan	Sparkman
Ecton	McFarland	Stennis
Ellender	McGrath	Stewart
Ferguson	McKellar	Taft
Flanders	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	Magnuson	Thye
Green	Maybank	Umstead
Gurney	Millikin	Watkins
Hatch	Moore	Wilson
Hayden	Morse	Young
Hill	Myers	

NOT VOTING—20

Ball	McCarthy	Tobey
Brewster	Malone	Tydings
Bushfield	Martin	Vandenberg
Butler	Murray	Wagner
Connally	O'Mahoney	White
George	Taylor	Wiley
Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. HAWKES' amendment was rejected.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that, as in executive session, the Senate may proceed to consider nominations in the armed services which will be presented by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], if the Chair will recognize him for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the Chair recognizes the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, for several months the Armed Services Committee has had before it a considerable number of nominations in the armed services. Included in the number are 590 colonels in the Air Force. There are also nominations in other branches of the armed services. They are routine nominations, with the exception of a few major generals and 6 brigadier generals in the Regular Army.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nominations, and I ask that they be considered en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire if the name of Colonel Sebree appears on the list?

Mr. GURNEY. I believe it does.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I vote against confirming the nomination of Colonel Sebree. I have no objection to the consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 472) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "reduced." and insert in lieu thereof "reduced; except that in no case shall the amount of the Federal allotment for any State be less than $5 multiplied by the number of children in such State from 5 to 17 years of age, inclusive, as determined under paragraph (A)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is obvious. It is to provide that none of the so-called well-to-do States shall receive less than $5 per child for children between the ages of 5 and 17. My reason for offering the amendment was fairly well explained the other afternoon when I spoke in general about the need for a minimum dollar provision in the bill. On checking the effect of the bill as it now stands, I find that, so far as the more well-to-do States are concerned, the minimum is substantially below the $5 figure which ostensibly has been set in the bill.

As will be noted, this amendment affects the language in paragraph (D) of section 4, in line 21 on page 16 of the bill. As the language now stands, it provides that in order to obtain the full amount of Federal aid which would be allotted under the formula provided in the bill, at least 2.5 percent of a State's income must be devoted to public educational purposes in the State, through the medium of local and State taxes.

It so happened that in a substantial majority of the States this is not the case. I readily agree that such an objective is desirable as an ultimate objective. At the same time, I feel equally positive that there should be a definite minimum of which every State should be sure at all times. That is why I am offering this amendment. It simply provides that, regardless of any other provision in the paragraph, every State shall receive a minimum of at least $5 per child within the age limits previously mentioned.

To indicate what I mean in connection with the more well-to-do States, I point out that by the latest figures, Maryland is raising only 1.2 percent of its tax income for public educational purposes; Delaware and Rhode Island, 1.4 percent; Connecticut and Nevada, 1.5 percent; California, Illinois, and Ohio, 1.6 percent; Massachusetts and New York, 1.7 percent; Michigan, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Washington, 1.8 percent; New Jersey and Oregon, 1.9 percent; and Indiana, 2 percent. I point out in connection with Indiana that of the 17 States which cannot possibly get anything back in the way of a balance of aid in their favor out of the proposal now before us, Indiana would receive the highest allowance, which would be $4 instead of $5 per pupil. Maryland would receive slightly more than $2 per pupil.

This seems to me to be altogether wrong. A minimum of $5 is not out of order. As I stated the other day, the more well-to-do States are entitled to a reasonable return. They are entitled to be assured that they will have a minimum return, and that is why I am offering the amendment which is now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this is a question which was not considered in the committee. On the whole, I am inclined to agree with the Senator from New York. If we admit the principle that every State should receive some aid, every State is having difficulty in increasing its taxes. I quite agree that probably it is right that the $5 allowance should be without deduction for penalty for failure to levy a certain amount of tax.

The figures cited by the Senator from New York, which are found on page 3391 of the RECORD, relate, I think, to the year 1946. The truth is that all those States are now raising a considerably larger percentage. So I think the Senator's fear that they will be docked, so to speak, as much as appears in this table, is somewhat overstated.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I appreciate very much the Senator's bringing that matter to the attention of the Senate. I meant to do so myself. I think it should be pointed out that the year 1946 was a year of high revenue, and that naturally the tax ratio would be comparatively low.

In this connection, however, I think it should be quite obvious that very few of the 17 States which I have named would receive the full $5 if the formula were left as it now is in the bill.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is quite correct. I am willing to accept the amendment unless there is objection on the part of other members of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN obtained the floor.

IMPAIRMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY BY DISOBEDIENCE TO LAW

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I send to the desk a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be received out of order and read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and read.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the reading of the resolution does not mean there is no objection to its present consideration, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the reading of the resolution does not mean that it is to be considered at this time.

Mr. EASTLAND. After it is read, Mr. President, I shall request its present consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and read.

The resolution (S. Res. 217) was read, as follows:

Whereas the civilian and military officials of the United States who are primarily responsible for its military security have advised the Congress and committees thereof that to insure the safety of the Nation it is imperative to increase the personnel of the armed forces on active duty and to take necessary steps to develop an adequately trained Reserve available for call to active duty in the event of a national emergency; and

Whereas the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate has been engaged for several days in conducting hearings on the recommendations of such officials and, in the interest of developing a program under which the obligations and privileges of military service and of training for the national security would be shared by our citizens in the fairest possible manner, has afforded an opportunity to all interested persons to present their views to the committee; and

Whereas there appeared before the committee on March 31, 1948, for the purpose of presenting their views certain spokesmen for the Committee Against Jimcrow in Military Service and Training; and

Whereas a certain A. Philip Randolph, one of such spokesmen, testified that unless Army policies and laws are so changed as to remove alleged racial segregation and discrimination in the armed forces, his committee would lead a drive to cause Negro citizens to refuse to assume their obligations under any laws which may be enacted by the Congress imposing obligations upon citizens to serve in the armed forces or to take training to fit them for call to active duty in such forces in the event of emergency; and

Whereas a certain Grant Reynolds, another spokesman for the Committee Against Jimcrow in Military Service and Training, who is commissioner of correction of the State of New York, in the course of his testimony before the Committee on Armed Services endorsed the testimony of A. Philip Randolph and stated that he would follow any program proposed by the said Randolph "including civil disobedience"; and

Whereas the Congress and the people of the entire Nation have been startled and bitterly disappointed that a high official of a State government, holding a key position of public trust under that government which should be held only by a person who favors scrupulous obedience to Federal and State laws, should advocate a program which would impair the national security of the United States; and

Whereas the United States Senate is of the opinion that the Governor of the State of New York should be fully apprised of the testimony of the said Grant Reynolds before

the Committee on Armed Services in order that the Governor may take such action as he may deem appropriate to mitigate the unfortunate effects of such testimony: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to obtain from the clerk of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a duly certified copy of the testimony given before such committee on March 31, 1948, and to forward such testimony, together with a copy of this resolution, to the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, for such action as he may deem appropriate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to point out at least one error in the resolution: Mr. Grant Reynolds is not the Commissioner of Correction of the State of New York. He is a member of the Commission of Correction of the State of New York, a body of nine members, which serves in a purely advisory capacity, and without any authority whatever. That point should be very definitely understood.

Furthermore, I should like to point out that I see no need for advising the Governor of the State of New York regarding this matter. The Governor of the State of New York is undoubtedly cognizant of it, without any action by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. I object to the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The resolution will go over, under the rule.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 472) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I call up amendment B, which I offer on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island desire to have the amendment read in full at this time?

Mr. GREEN. No; I do not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the amendment will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The amendment proposed by Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. McGRATH) in the nature of a substitute for the bill is as follows:

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

"That for the purpose of assisting the several States in improving and maintaining their systems of free public education by supplementing the salaries of teachers in free public elementary and secondary schools there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 2. From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first section of this act, the United States Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") is authorized to make grants to the States which have accepted the provisions of this act as hereinafter provided. The proceeds of such grants shall be available for expenditure by such States exclusively for the purpose of supplementing the salaries of teachers in free public elementary and secondary schools within their respective jurisdictions.

"SEC. 3. The amounts of grants authorized to be made under this act to any State during any fiscal year shall be determined by multiplying the number of pupils in average daily attendance in the free public elementary and secondary schools within such State by $15. Such grants shall be paid in quarterly installments computed on the basis of attendance during the preceding quarter.

"SEC. 4. (a) In order to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under this act a State—

"(1) through its legislature, shall (A) accept the provisions of this act and provide for the administration of funds to be received; (B) provide that the State treasurer, or corresponding official in the State, shall receive the funds paid to the State under this act and shall submit annually a detailed statement of the amount so received and of its disbursement; (C) provide that its State educational authority shall represent the State in the administration of funds received; (D) provide for an audit by the State educational authority of the expenditure of funds received and allocated to local school jurisdictions, and for a system of reports from local school jurisdictions to such authority; (E) provide that the State educational authority shall make quarterly reports, in such form as the Commissioner shall prescribe, showing the number of pupils in daily attendance in free public elementary and secondary schools within such State during the preceding quarter, and such other reports as the Commissioner may deem necessary to enable him to carry out his functions under this act; (F) provide that there will be expended in such State from State or local sources, during any fiscal year for which a grant is made under this act, an amount for payment of teachers' salaries which is not less than the amount expended from such sources for such purposes during the last preceding fiscal year; and (G) provide that from the grants received under this act for a fiscal year there shall be paid quarterly to each free public elementary and secondary school within such State an amount equal to $15 for each pupil in average daily attendance in such school during the preceding quarter;

"(2) shall transmit through its State educational authority to the United States Commissioner of Education official notice of acceptance and certified copies of the legislative enactments and the official regulations that may be issued by the State educational authority in connection with such funds. Any amendment of such enactments and revisions of official regulations shall, in like manner, be transmitted to the Commissioner.

"SEC. 5. The Commissioner shall, prior to the beginning of each quarter, estimate the amount to be paid for such quarter to a State which has accepted the provisions of this act, and shall certify the amount so estimated, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which he finds that his estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State for such quarter, to the Secretary of the Treasury who shall, through the Fiscal Service of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the treasurer or corresponding official of such State, as soon as possible after the beginning of each quarter, the amount certified by the Commissioner with respect to such quarter. Each such treasurer shall account for the moneys received, and shall pay out such funds only on the requisition of the State educational authority.

"SEC. 6. Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State which has accepted the provisions of this act, finds that any funds paid to such State under section 5 have been expended for any purpose not authorized by this act, he may withhold further certifications until the funds so expended shall have been repaid.

"SEC. 7. As used in this act—

"(a) The term 'State' includes the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

"(b) The term 'State educational authority' means, as the State legislature may determine, (1) the chief State school officer (such as the State superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of education, or similar officer), or (2) a board of education controlling the State department of education; except that in the District of Columbia it shall mean the Board of Education.

"(c) The term 'teacher' includes persons engaged in instruction, but does not include persons engaged solely in the supervision or administration of instruction.

"SEC. 8. No department, agency, or officer of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any school with respect to which any funds are expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement under this act relating to any grant made under this act authorize any agency or officer of the United States to control the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, or materials of instruction with respect to any such school."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to assist the States in improving and maintaining their systems of free public education by providing funds to be used for supplementing teachers' salaries."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, this amendment to Senate bill 472, which in effect is a substitute bill, was introduced in the Senate for myself and my colleague, Senator McGRATH. It aims to provide Federal funds to be used to supplement the present inadequate salaries of public-school teachers. It was originally introduced as Senate bill 81 and later was amended. We now present it as an amendment to Senate bill 472, the measure now under consideration.

I am advised by John W. Studebaker, Commissioner of the United States Office of Education, that the only Federal funds furnished to the States for teachers' salaries are, first, those supplied to land-grant colleges, something less than $6,000,000 a year, through the United States Office of Education; and, second, approximately $21,000,000 a year for certain aspects of vocational education of secondary school grade in the fields of agriculture, trades and industries, home economics, and to a very limited extent in business education. These two amounts are utilized in providing some of the money which certain school teachers are paid.

This amendment has the merit of being direct, brief, and unambiguous. It authorizes an annual appropriation of $15 per pupil to be used to supplement teachers' salaries in secondary and elementary public schools. My colleague and I arrived at this figure of $15 per pupil after conferring with several noted educators, all interested in the teachers' present plight of underpayment. At $15 per pupil, the appropriation authorized would amount to some $259,000,000, based on the reported daily attendance in such schools in 1945. Assuming an average pupil-teacher ratio of 30 pupils per teacher, the measure would authorize an appropriation sufficient to provide an increase amounting to about $450 a year for each elementary and secondary school teacher in the United States and its Territories.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in their report submitted by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] recognized the shortage of teachers and the necessity for providing additional funds for the salaries of secondary and elementary school teachers. I quote from their report:

School systems are unable to compete with other occupations for competent and trained personnel because of a lack of funds.—During the war period teachers in unusually large numbers left the profession for better-paying opportunities in nonteaching employment. At least 350,000 qualified teachers left during the years from 1941 to 1945, many never to return. This exodus, largely caused by low pay, was in turn due to insufficient funds for educational purposes.

Under the pressure of higher living costs and the turn-over in the employment, school systems have raised salaries. The States have increased their financial aid. Yet in spite of this only two States have been able to enact a $2,400-minimum-salary law for new teachers. Most States still have legal minimums below $2,000 annually even for teachers with 4 years of college preparation; one-third have prescribed no official minimum salary.

At the beginning of the school year 1946–47 careful estimates indicated that nearly 54 percent of the teachers in public schools were to be paid less than $2,000 for the year; 16 percent had been promised salaries of less than $1,200.

Salaries in teaching are so unattractive that an unprecedentedly small number of college students are preparing for teaching. Although enrollments in all colleges have been swelled by GI's and those whose education was delayed by the war, teachers' colleges have not grown in size comparable to other types of institutions. Of those enrolled in teachers' colleges in 1941 nearly 90 percent took courses leading to employment in teaching; in 1946–47 only 67 percent of teacher-college enrollments were in teacher-preparatory courses.

This amendment is designed to be exclusively a teachers' salary-improvement measure. Insofar as the present critical teacher shortage stems from the inability of the States and communities to provide more adequate salaries for elementary- and secondary-school teachers, Federal assistance is definitely needed and desirable.

As originally introduced, payments would be made directly to the school districts. However, we have been advised that in order to comply with this provision of the bill, the United States Office of Education would need a very large staff. I sent copies of the bill to all State directors or commissioners of education in the country and requested their comments and suggestions. Practically all of them, while approving of the other provisions of the bill, suggested that the bill be amended so that the funds would be channeled through the State director or commissioner of education, instead of directly to the officials of a given school district. We believe this suggestion is a good one, and, consequently, the amendment now under discussion provides that the payments be made, not to school districts, but to State education officials.

The replies I have received from the State directors and commissioners of education have been gratifying. In order not to take the time of the Senate, I ask permission to insert the replies in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I may state, however, that these replies have come from Federal officials and from the heads of the educational departments in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Arizona, California, the Canal Zone, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Virginia, and West Virginia. One letter is from Hon. J. W. Studebaker, Commissioner of the United States Office of Education. In it he comments on the original bill, S. 81, and the suggestions made by him, together with practically all the suggestions made by the various directors and commissioners of education, are incorporated in the amendment now offered, and on which the Senate is to vote.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. GREEN. There are no stringent Federal controls provided for in this bill, and no attempt is made in behalf of the Federal Government to dominate education in the States or local communities. The only requirement is that certified reports must be made as to average daily attendance. The amendment is designed to meet a specific need; it is to render direct assistance to the elementary and secondary public school teachers in the country in their struggle to maintain a decent standard of living. Thus, it goes to the heart of our present educational problem.

The United States now spends only 1.5 percent of its national income for its schools as compared with 3 percent, or twice our percentage, spent by Great Britain and 7.5 percent, or 5 times our percentage, by the Soviet Union. The cost of the program proposed for direct Federal aid for teachers would raise our present ratio from 1.5 percent to 1.8 percent. This three-tenths of 1 percent increase is certainly not large in proportion to the wealth of our great Nation, nor in proportion to the need for good schools and good teachers, nor in proportion to what we as a Nation will get in return. No function of government is more important than public education. In a democracy like ours it is a fundamental necessity, and nowhere else in our Government are false economies so costly in the end.

Today, in a world of swiftly changing standards and events when the future peace and security of the world hang in the balance and freemen everywhere are looking to America for leadership and guidance, the kind of education we provide for our young people is more important than ever before. As a nation, our responsibility to these young people has increased. The future greatness of America, as a great nation and a world power, will depend in large measure upon the character, intelligence, and degree of enlightenment of these millions of young Americans who are now in our schools. They need and are entitled to the very best in education that we as a nation can possibly give them. We must send them forth equipped to meet and solve the great problems of the future. Their future and ours demand that we do this.

The job of educating young America for its great responsibilities in the years ahead is not and cannot any longer be entirely a local or State matter. Federal assistance is not only desirable, it is essential.

We are faced with a critical teacher shortage and in several States and municipalities emergency measures have been formulated to keep our schools open. Substitute teachers are doing a good and loyal service. However, in many cases these substitutes have only a little more schooling than their pupils. Adequate compensation should be provided for the teachers for the services they render, and it is only through Federal assistance that this compensation can be provided.

Conditions in many of our municipalities are alarming, and the reason lies in the fact that our teachers as a group are shamefully underpaid. This amendment provides additional funds for salaries only for those teachers in the elementary and secondary schools. The amendment does not appropriate funds for executive salaries or for teaching supplies or transportation or other such purposes. I believe that higher teacher salaries will be an inducement for students in our colleges to pursue a teacher's career and at a wage more nearly commensurate with their training and education.

In conclusion it may be helpful for me to compare the amending bill with the pending bill, Senate bill 472.

They both require action by the legislatures of the different States and certification to the United States Commissioner of education by the State educational director or commissioner.

They both provide for payments to the State to be made in quarterly installments.

They both specifically prohibit Federal control of education in the States.

Now, let me point out the principal differences between them.

(a) The amending bill is, to use the language of Mr. Studebaker, "direct, brief, and unambiguous," and provides $15.00 per pupil based on an average daily attendance in the free public elementary and secondary schools. Senate

bill 472 is long and complicated and provides $5.00 as a basis for all children between the ages of five and seventeen whether in public schools or not.

(b) It deals with the fundamental question of teachers' salaries which everyone agrees are too low throughout the whole country, but it avoids all the controversial questions arising under S. 472 such as provisions for private schools, the segregation of pupils, and so forth.

(c) It goes directly to the principal deficiency in the present situation, namely, lack of good teachers and cuts out less important matters such as executive salaries, administrative expenses, equipment, supplies, transportation, etc. arising under Senate bill 472.

(d) It treats all the States alike, yet teachers in the poorer States get a proportional increase greater than those in the richer States. For example, assuming that this year in a State like Indiana, the average teacher will get $3,000, he would under this amendment get $3,450, or an increase of 15 percent. However, assuming that in a State like Mississippi the teacher will get $1,200, he would get $1,650, or an increase of 37½ percent.

(e) Under the amendment the initial appropriation is less, $259,000,000 instead of $300,000,000, a saving of some $41,000,000.

So, it seems to me that this amendment should appeal to the greater number of my colleagues here in the Senate, and, furthermore, that, if adopted, it will be to the greater advantage of the schools of our country.

EXHIBIT A

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending me on February 1, 1947, a copy of S. 81 and your courtesy in inviting my comments and any suggestions with regard to proposed amendments.

This bill has the great virtue of being direct, brief, and unambiguous. It would authorize an annual appropriation of funds of $15 per pupil in average daily attendance in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States, including the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, to be used by local public school districts to supplement teachers' salaries. At $15 per pupil the appropriation authorized would amount to some $295,070,970, if based on a reported daily attendance in such schools in the continental United States of 19,671,398 pupils for 1945.

The appropriation would be distributed by the Commissioner as grants to local school districts to be used exclusively to supplement the salaries of public elementary and secondary school teachers. The bill is designed to be exclusively a teachers' salary improvement measure. Insofar as the present critical teacher shortage stems from the inability of States and their local communities to provide more adequate salaries for public elementary and secondary school teachers, Federal assistance would appear to be eminently desirable.

Assuming an average pupil-teacher ratio of 30 pupils per teacher, the bill would authorize appropriations sufficient to provide an increase averaging $450 for each public elementary and secondary school teacher in the United States and its Territories. Just how the Federal grants would be distributed as teachers' salary supplements within any local public school jurisdiction would be left to the discretion of the school authorities thereof.

This bill apparently does not undertake to reduce the competitive disadvantage under which poorer school districts in poorer States now labor in recruiting and holding well-qualified teachers. A school district, regardless of its wealth or present teachers' salary schedule, might apply for and receive a grant to be used to supplement teachers' salaries.

Serious question might be raised concerning the method of administration proposed in S. 81. The administrative relationship appears to be almost exclusively between the Federal Government and the local school district, except that the local school district seeking the benefits of the act must file an application for a Federal grant through its State educational authority. This arrangement would seem to involve the United States Office of Education in the detailed task of approving applications from most of the 111,273 public elementary and secondary school districts in the United States. Moreover, there would be the duty of receiving and processing required quarterly attendance reports from all of the school districts which had applied for grants, computing the amounts of the grants, and certifying these to the Treasurer of the United States. This whole operation would require the employment of a very large staff in the United States Office of Education.

Again, under section 6, there is the clear implication that the Commissioner of Education must undertake to determine or find whether any assurance required by the provisions of section 4 to be given in such application is not being carried out and in case of such finding the Commissioner shall withhold any further certification of funds. This again would appear to require a large staff of Federal auditors or inspectors to make such determinations or findings with respect to thousands of local public school districts.

All of this administrative difficulty and the building up of a large Federal staff to administer S. 81 might be avoided if the bill were amended in such fashion that the several State educational agencies were made responsible for administration of the act within the respective States. Administrative relationships with the Federal Government should, it seems to me, be with and through the State educational agencies, acting as trustees for Federal grants made to them on the basis of an objective apportionment formula written into the act.

Cordially yours,

J. W. STUDEBAKER,
Commissioner.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1947.

Memorandum to Mr. Giddings.

I have your note requesting an unofficial comment on Senator GREEN's Federal-aid bill (S. 81) and am glad to give my personal opinion. I cannot, of course, express an official opinion for the National Education Association.

First let me mention several good points of Senator GREEN's proposal:

1. He is to be congratulated for his interest in the welfare of teachers and his desire to improve their status by this rather direct proposal to increase salaries. We in the National Education Association appreciate the fact that the quality of education is determined by the quality of the teachers in the classrooms. The first requisite for obtaining and maintaining high quality in the supply of teachers is the provision of salaries which permit teachers to live at the economic and cultural levels required for their tasks.

2. The Senator is wise in providing that the administration of the funds shall be through the United States Office of Education. He seeks to provide the Commissioner with authority necessary to carry out his assignment (see item No. 7 below).

3. He provides that school systems shall not reduce their expenditures below those of the year preceding that in which they begin to receive Federal aid.

4. His proposal forbids Federal officials from exercising any control over administration and instruction in local school systems.

5. By his definition of the term "public-school district" I think the Senator's bill is less ambiguous than some of the bills that have been introduced into Congress.

In making criticisms of Senator GREEN's bill I shall attempt to keep to fundamental points and principles:

1. I have not taken time to compute accurately the amount of money that the Senator's bill would require but I estimate that, if all school districts asked for funds, it would require from $300,000,000 to $350,000,000. While I agree that the public schools eventually should have from one-half to one billion dollars from Federal sources, I think it is better to approach through steps such as $200,000,000, $250,000,000, $300,000,000, and so on for the first few years. This gradual approach will permit wise adjustment to the increased revenues.

2. The proposal provides only for a fixed sum of $15 per child in average daily attendance to be given to all types of school districts—rich and poor. On the basis of State experience we now know that uniform allotment on the basis of attendance is not usually the best basis. If a choice must be made then the equalization idea should be used first or used in combination with the uniform grant. Flat grants, without equalization, tend to increase the differences between rich and poor school districts.

3. The plan provides that the United States Commissioner shall deal somewhat directly with each local school district. I recognize that the Senator provides that each district shall apply "through the educational authority in the State" but he does not specify what the authority of the State officials shall be. Hence, if the school district's application is not complete or is of doubtful accuracy presumably the Commissioner would have to negotiate directly with the local authorities. The experience of the ODT during the war was that responsibility had to be placed on State authorities since the United States Commissioner could not possibly have the staff or facilities to pass on the requests of individual school districts. Counting the one-teacher school districts the United States Office of Education would have to have contacts with about 100,000 school districts.

4. The bill requires that the Federal funds must be used to supplement teachers' salaries. While this is a worthy purpose Congress should have recognized this primary need about 4 years ago when the condition was universal. In the next few years, the salary situation will be very uneven throughout the Nation because some States and localities recently have made significant steps forward while other areas have not or cannot pay adequate salaries. The three critical needs today are: Adequate salaries, new equipment, and new buildings. Many local districts have already poured such large sums into salaries that a crisis exists in instructional supplies and school housing. Since 75 to 80 percent of most school budgets are now going for salaries I would rather see the Senator's bill provide that 25 percent of the allotment could be used for purposes other than salaries.

5. The bill uses average daily attendance as a basis for allotting funds. While there is much to be said for using ADA, since it

encourages districts to improve attendance, ADA is not uniformly computed in all of the States. The Commissioner would have to specify how ADA was to be computed for the purpose of the Federal law and this method might not agree with the definition used for State purposes under State law.

6. It seems to me that computing ADA on a quarterly basis is unnecessarily complicated. It would force local districts to employ additional personnel to fill out a number of new forms. For practical purposes each district could certify as to ADA for the preceding school year and then avoid extra work, since this report is made annually to the State, and the district would also be in a better position to estimate what it could expect from the Federal Government in planning its budget.

7. I find nothing in the bill that provides for any kind of appeal from the Commissioner's decisions. Presumably he can reduce or withhold the sums due to a school district and no one can do anything about it. I doubt that any Federal Commissioner should have such absolute powers.

8. The proposal does not provide for Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, and possibly other outlying areas under the American flag.

FRANK W. HUBBARD,
Director, Research Division.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 18, 1947.*

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I regret that there has been such a long delay in replying to your communication, addressed to this office several weeks ago, accompanied by a copy of S. 81, "A bill to assist the States in improving and maintaining their systems of free public education by providing funds to be used for supplementing teachers' salaries," which was introduced by you and Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

Due to the pressure of so much important school business, including pending legislation, it has not been possible to give proper attention at an earlier date to the bill which you introduced providing money for grants to be made to the States and the District of Columbia, based upon the average daily attendance in the public elementary and secondary schools. Since the average daily attendance in the public schools on December 12, 1946, was 84,067 pupils, this would entitle the Board of Education to receive a Federal grant of $1,261,005.

The provision of this bill that the grants be made by the United States Commissioner of Education to be used for supplementing the salaries of the teachers in the public school systems is indeed a worthy undertaking. It is my opinion that this is a very desirable piece of legislation, particularly needed at this time of great crisis in education. This proposed bill should have the support of school districts throughout the country.

Yours very sincerely,
HOBART M. CORNING,
Superintendent of Schools.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
Juneau, Alaska, January 28, 1947.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Senator, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Thank you very much for your letter of January 9 and for the attached copy of S. 81. Of course it is not necessary for me to remind you that teachers' salaries throughout the Nation are a disgrace, for I am sure that is the very thing you have in mind in introducing your bill.

I have read the bill rather carefully and, while it will not mean a great deal to Alaska, I wholeheartedly endorse the measure. Any measure which will help the poor States to improve educational standards will aid Alaska. Who knows what child who is now in the public schools of Mississippi may someday be in a position of authority in Alaska.

I feel confident that all school people everywhere are endorsing S. 81.

Sincerely,
JAMES C. RYAN,
Commissioner of Education.

STATE OF ARIZONA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Phoenix, January 16, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 9 in which you enclosed a copy of S. 81 which was introduced in the Senate on January 8 by Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH and yourself. I should like to say at the outset that I am heartily in agreement with the proposal and I sincerely believe that its adoption would be helpful in averting the existing teacher crisis. We are experiencing in Arizona a situation similar to that faced by all of our States with reference to the supply of teachers.

In this State we are at the present time obliged to fill approximately 12 percent of our teaching positions with teachers having less than standard qualifications.

I have but two suggestions to make concerning this proposal:

1. I suggest that section 3 be amended to limit the number of pupils in average daily attendance per teacher, or in other words, per classroom, upon which any district may draw Federal aid. I would suggest that this limitation be not in excess of an average of 35 or 40 pupils per certified teacher employed in each school district. This limitation would prevent encouragement of overcrowding classrooms which, I believe, would be the inevitable result of apportioning such funds without this limitation.

2. I would further suggest that in order that the provisions of this act be consistent with established practice in payment and administration of Federal funds appropriated for educational use by the various States. Section 5 be amended to provide for payment by the commissioners to the State Educational Agency for distribution to the several districts of each State such sums as are warranted by required reports on average daily attendance.

Yours sincerely,
NOLAN D. PULLIAM,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Sacramento, January 30, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE F. GREEN,
United States Senate,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Thank you for sending the copy of S. 81 which you introduced in the Senate January 8, 1947. Superintendent Simpson and I have discussed this measure, and he is deeply interested, and has asked that you be commended in this letter for sponsoring its introduction.

We are happy to see section 8 included, as there is always the fear of Federal dictation of policy should Federal financial aid be accepted. We have no suggestions as to additions to this bill; it is satisfactory as is.

The people of California, at the election held last November, voted a State constitutional amendment to provide a minimum salary of $2,400 for public-school teachers. This was done to make the profession more attractive to those who may be encouraged to train as teachers, and to provide at least that minimum salary be guaranteed to those teachers in service.

There is a tremendous shortage of teachers in California as well as in other States in the Union, and it is our feeling that one important way to provide more teachers is through more adequate salaries. At the present time in California, there are approximately 45,000 teachers employed by the public schools. There are 12,358 teachers holding emergency credentials; therefore, California has a shortage of regularly qualified teachers of 12,358.

Since we believe so firmly in the need for more adequate salaries for teachers, we join with you in supporting S. 81.

Yours very truly,
GEO. E. HOGAN.

THE PANAMA CANAL,
DIVISION OF SCHOOLS,
Balboa Heights, C. Z., January 25, 1947.

The Honorable THEODORE F. GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: In response to your letter of January 10, 1947, with reference to bill S. 81, you are advised that the Canal Zone schools are operated under direct appropriations of funds by Congress and teachers' salaries are fixed on the basis of salaries paid in the District of Columbia. S. 81 in its present form would not apply to the Canal Zone (section 7 (a)), and this office feels that there is no apparent reason for recommending that the Canal Zone be included. This office does not feel qualified to comment on the effect of the bill in the United States.

Sincerely yours,
BEN M. WILLIAMS,
Superintendent of Schools.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Honolulu, January 27, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Member, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Thank you very much for your letter of January 10, 1947, transmitting a copy of your Senate bill 81, providing for augmentation of teachers' salaries throughout the country and in Hawaii. This bill, to my mind, represents a forward-looking viewpoint and if realized, would be a positive and notable contribution to the welfare of the country through the improvement of education.

There is just one point which I would raise as a subject for possible amendment. Section 4, paragraph (b) states that the district shall expend "an amount for payment of teachers' salaries which is not less than the amount expended from such sources for such purposes during the next preceding fiscal year." Hawaii, like many of the States now pays to each of its teachers a monthly "cost-of-living" bonus. When such a bonus might be removed, would the benefit to be gained under the bill be lost since the amount paid for teachers' salaries would be less?

We shall look forward hopefully to favorable action by the Congress. With sincere thanks for your thoughtfulness and good efforts, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
RICHARD E. MEYER,
Assistant Superintendent.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
Springfield, February 4, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Recently you sent to me a copy of S. 81 which you introduced in the Senate on January 8, 1947 together with your colleague, Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH. I have asked various members of

my department and secured their reaction on certain sections of the bill.

On page 2, section 3, lines 10 to 17, we feel that required quarterly reports are rather difficult for the reason that it is impossible for us to secure sufficient data upon which to make such report. All data which we use for school purposes in Illinois are from the annual report. It occurs to us that an annual estimate prepared upon our annual reports should be sufficient to serve throughout the year, then any difference at the end of the year could be adjusted at that time.

In section 4 (c) we are of the opinion that one application filed not later than September 15 should be sufficient. In this section we also object to the quarterly report requirements. If the above suggestions are accepted then section 5 becomes unnecessary.

In section 6 we are definitely of the opinion that the problems referred to there should be handled in the State office in the respective States and the State office should have the contacts with the United States Commissioner of Education.

The question was asked regarding paragraph (c), section 7—"Why discriminate against supervisors and administrators"? Some of these people in smaller States fall in the same category with respect to salary that teachers do.

I trust that you will find these suggestions constructive and helpful to you in regard to this bill.

Sincerely yours,

VERNON L. NICKELL,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

STATE OF KANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Topeka, Kans., January 21, 1947.

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
Washington, L. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Thank you for the copy of the bill on appropriation of Federal funds for the improvement of teachers' salaries. I believe that such legislation is much needed in order to keep our schools going.

I appreciate your courtesy.

Very truly yours,

L. W. BROOKS,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baton Rouge, February 17, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: On February 8 I wrote you in reference to S. 81, which you introduced in the Senate for yourself and your colleague, Senator MCGRATH. In my letter to you I stated that I very much preferred S. 472 as a general aid-to-education bill, but I stated that if this bill were not acceptable to the Senate and House, I should be glad to see the particular measure which you have introduced become law. I further stated that "personally I have no objections whatever to any of the provisions of your S. 81."

In making this statement, I am assuming that the term "public school district" as used in section 7 (b), line 21, page 4, would be so interpreted as to make possible the distribution of the funds in accordance with the laws of those States which operate under a county-unit system, as in Louisiana and in many Southern States. If this expression should be interpreted in such a way as to give the Federal Treasury authority to bypass the State departments of education and the parish (county) school boards in the distribution of these funds to the schools of the several parishes of the State, then I should be opposed to the measure. In Louisiana, as you perhaps know, all Federal and State funds are distributed to the parish school boards and the parish boards in turn reallocate the funds to the several schools within the parish. However, as I have indicated in my statement to you, I am assuming that the language of your bill would be so interpreted as to use the funds in our State as our State funds are used. If this is your interpretation of the bill, I suggest that you modify section 7 (B) to read as follows: "The term 'public-school district' means a county, a district, a town, or other local governmental subdivision having the supervision of public schools within its jurisdiction." I think this clarification of your measure would make it more acceptable.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN E. COXE,
State Superintendent.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baton Rouge, February 8, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I regret my delay in answering your letter of January 10, relative to S. 81, which you introduced in the Senate for yourself and your colleague, Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH. However, I have purposely awaited the receipt of the various measures introduced in Congress for giving aid to the elementary and secondary schools of the country. I desire to see them all before endorsing any particular measure.

After thoroughly considering all of the Senate and House bills dealing with this subject, it seems to me that the most comprehensive measure and the one from which most good would flow is S. 472, by Senators TAFT, HILL, THOMAS, and others. It strikes me that this measure, being strictly an equalization proposal, is what is desired in the country at large. I wish, however, to say that, should it develop that S. 472 is not acceptable to the Senate and House, I should certainly be glad to see the particular measure which you have introduced become law. Personally, I have no objections whatever to any of the provisions of your S. 81. I simply feel that S. 472 is more comprehensive and is calculated to provide more general relief. I shall keep in touch with you and give you from time to time my impressions of the various measures introduced for the relief of our public elementary and secondary school systems.

Thanking you for your letter, and with best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

JOHN E. COXE,
State Superintendent.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baltimore, Md., January 23, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I wish to thank you for your letter of January 10, enclosing copy of a bill you introduced in the Senate on January 8, providing for the appropriation of funds for teachers' salaries.

Our board has taken no official position on matters involving Federal legislation, but, in my opinion, we are not going to have teachers for our children unless additional salaries are made possible by some governmental agency.

Sincerely yours,

T. G. PULLEN, Jr.,
State Superintendent of Schools.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Lansing, Mich., January 28, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: With your letter of January 10 you enclosed copy of Senate bill 81.

We have made some analysis of the bill and find that we would have several objections. In section 2, we believe that the grants should be made to the States for school districts rather than to school districts direct.

Section 3 provides that money shall be distributed on average daily attendance. It has been our experience that the distribution of funds on the basis of average daily attendance tends to force children into school when they should be home, to say nothing of the fact that teachers and administrators are continually confronted with finding ways to forget absences, thereby increasing the average attendance. We believe that average daily membership figures rather than average day attendance figures are much more honest and do not force children into school when they should be home because of illness.

Section 4 (b) requires that State and local governments spend as much each year as they spent the year before. It is obvious that during depression periods that both State and local governments will have to curtail expenditures and would thereby fail to receive funds from the Federal Government at a time when they would be most needed.

Section 5 provides for the distribution of funds to each school district. It appears to us that this would be almost an impossible task for the Federal Government to deal directly with 127,000 school districts, many of which are not on regular mail routes. We have found in the distribution of our own State funds that with 5,000 districts it is necessary for us to route funds to the respective counties and hence to school districts.

We are most happy to have this opportunity to review the legislation proposed and hope, along with other school people in our State, that Federal funds will be provided to assist in the education of the children.

Yours sincerely,

EUGENE B. ELLIOTT,
Superintendent.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Jackson, January 17, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I appreciate your letter of January 10 enclosing a copy of S. 81 which you have introduced in the United States Senate to assist the States in improving and maintaining their systems of free public education by providing funds to be used for supplementing teachers' salaries.

I shall examine and study this bill at my first opportunity and assure you that it is gratifying to see this interest on your part in the great need for providing greater support for the teachers of our Nation.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. TUBB,
State Superintendent of Education.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Jefferson, February 5, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: For a number of years there has been a feeling on the part of many people that there is a need for equalization of educational opportunities for the United States as a whole. Children in many States are able to receive a fine education while those of other States have educational advantages of a very poor quality.

We in Missouri are interested in education for all children. For that reason, we wish to commend you for Senate bill No. 81, and we would be pleased to hear from you further in regard to this bill.

Very truly yours,

HUBERT WHEELER,
Commissioner of Education.

STATE OF NEVADA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Las Vegas, Nev., February 21, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Committee on Appropriations,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I approve of your bill, S. 81. This is of interest to me and I feel it is a move in the right direction.

I do not see that the schools of this Nation will be able to accomplish what they should for the youth unless we are able to secure some Federal aid.

Sincerely,

ROXIE COPENHAVER,
Deputy Superintendent, Fifth Supervision District.

SPARKS CITY SCHOOLS,
Sparks, Nev., February 19, 1947.

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Thank you for your letter and a copy of the bill, S. 81. I think the intention of the bill to supplement teachers' salaries and thereby equalize, to some extent education throughout the States is good. The bill is not complicated and I further like it for that reason.

However, I think much of the objection to Federal aid comes from the fact, that along with the aid comes so much red tape in the form of reports, that extra employees have to be hired to take care of them. On lines 13, 14, and 15, on page 3, I see a wonderful opportunity for the United States Office of Education to run us ragged. Why not cut out those three lines?

Sincerely yours,

PROCTOR R. HUG,
Superintendent.

STATE OF NEVADA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Carson City, January 20, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Thank you for your letter of January 10 with which you enclosed a copy of S. 81 of the first session of the Eightieth Congress.

I propose to give your bill careful consideration and to study how its application would affect the schools of this State. Our gravest problem, in my opinion, is the small rural school district in areas of small assessed valuation, where school funds are not sufficient to pay a teacher an adequate salary. Because of our great distances and small population, we must provide public schools in areas having as few as three resident children of school age. This naturally increases our school costs yet, due to distance and winter weather conditions, consolidation of many of these schools is utterly impossible.

You will be interested in knowing that at the session of the Nevada State Legislature which convenes today, we propose to introduce two bills seeking increased State support of our public schools, so that a minimum teacher's salary of $2,400 annually may be established in this State.

As one of the authors of S. 81, you obviously believe that support of public education is a Federal responsibility. I am glad to know your attitude on this, for I certainly realize that education is not entirely the duty of a State or a locality and that we must have a better quality of educational opportunity available for every child in these United States.

I should appreciate it very much if you would be so kind as to send a copy of your bill to Mr. Procter R. Hug, superintendent of the Sparks city schools, Sparks, Nev., and to each of my deputy superintendents: Mrs. Kate St. Clair, Elko Nev.; Mr. Donald K. Perry, Ely, Nev.; Mrs. Kathryn L. Sterling, Lovelock, Nev.; Mr. Byron F. Stetler, post-office box 680, Reno, Nev.; Miss Roxie Copenhaver, post-office box 390, Las Vegas, Nev.; and Mr. George E. McCracken, Carson City, Nev. Mr. Hug is the president of the Nevada State Educational Association.

Very truly yours,

MILDRED BRAY,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

Miss MILDRED BRAY,
State Superintendent of
Public Instruction,
Department of Education,
Carson City, Nev.

MY DEAR MISS BRAY: Thank you for your letter of January 20 letting me have your comments on S. 81, the bill I introduced in the Senate for myself and my colleague, Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

I certainly am glad to have your comments regarding this measure and today I am complying with your request and sending copies to the persons listed in your letter.

If you have any suggestions as to amendments, I trust you will not hesitate to write me accordingly.

Yours very truly,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

Mr. PROCTER R. HUG,
Superintendent of the
Sparks City Schools,
Sparks, Nev.

MY DEAR MR. HUG: At the request of Miss Mildred Bray, State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Nevada, I am forwarding you a copy of S. 81, a bill I introduced in the Senate for myself and my colleague, Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

I believe this measure will be of interest to you and trust you will not hesitate to let me have your comments on it.

Yours very truly,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

Mr. GEORGE E. MCCRACKEN,
Deputy Superintendent
Department of Education,
Carson City, Nev.

MY DEAR MR. MCCRACKEN: At the request of Miss Mildred Bray, State Superintendent of public instruction of Nevada, I am forwarding you a copy of S. 81, a bill I introduced in the Senate for myself and my colleague, Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

I believe this measure will be of interest to you and trust you will not hesitate to let me have your comments on it.

Yours very truly,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

Mrs. KATE ST. CLAIR,
Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education, Elko, Nev.

MY DEAR MRS. ST. CLAIR: At the request of Miss Mildred Bray, State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Nevada, I am forwarding you a copy of S. 81, a bill I introduced in the Senate for myself and my colleague, Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

I believe this measure will be of interest to you and trust you will not hesitate to let me have your comments on it.

Yours very truly,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

Miss ROXIE COPENHAVER,
Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education, Las Vegas, Nev.

MY DEAR MISS COPENHAVER: At the request of Miss Mildred Bray, State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Nevada, I am forwarding you a copy of S. 81, a bill I introduced in the Senate for myself and my colleague, Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

I believe this measure will be of interest to you and trust you will not hesitate to let me have your comments on it.

Yours very truly,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

Mr. BYRON F. STETLER,
Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education, Reno, Nev.

MY DEAR MR. STETLER: At the request of Miss Mildred Bray, State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Nevada, I am forwarding you a copy of S. 81, a bill I introduced in the Senate for myself and my colleague, Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

I believe this measure will be of interest to you and trust you will not hesitate to let me have your comments on it.

Yours very truly,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

Mrs. KATHRYN L. STERLING,
Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education, Carson City, Nev.

MY DEAR MRS. STERLING: At the request of Miss Mildred Bray, State superintendent of public instruction of Nevada, I am forwarding you a copy of S. 81, a bill I introduced in the Senate for myself and my colleague, Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

I believe this measure will be of interest to you and trust you will not hesitate to let me have your comments on it.

Your very truly,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

Mr. DONALD K. PERRY,
Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education, Ely, Nev.

MY DEAR MR. PERRY: At the request of Miss Mildred Bray, State superintendent of public instruction of Nevada, I am forwarding you a copy of S. 81, a bill I introduced in the Senate for myself and my colleague, Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

I believe this measure will be of interest to you and trust you will not hesitate to let me have your comments on it.

Yours very truly,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
STATE HOUSE,
Concord, February 17, 1947.

Senator THEODORE F. GREEN,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: This is to express to you our feeling that a Federal-aid bill recently introduced by you and your colleague, Senator MCGRATH, fails to meet either the substantive or administrative requirements of a good Federal-aid law for education.

For many decades educators throughout the United States have resisted the infiltration of Federal agents into local schools. Not only the chief State school officers, who are unanimous on the subject, but educators generally throughout the United States, believe that every educational program emanating from the Federal Government should stop at the State level. The violation of this principle was the main reason why the National Youth Administration was opposed so bitterly by educators.

We hope you will consider these objections, and move to amend your bill or to withdraw it so that the basic principles which educators have tried to achieve for many years may not be violated further.

Respectfully yours,

EDGAR FULLER,
Commissioner of Education.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Santa Fe, February 20, 1947.

Senator GREEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I have information to the effect that the above-numbered Senate bill provides for appropriation of Federal funds for the purpose of aiding public-school education in the various States, and that the procedure of distribution is such that the funds will be sent direct from the Federal Government to the local school districts.

We will certainly appreciate any Federal aid that can be sent to New Mexico for public-school education but feel that in order to obtain full cooperation it is absolutely necessary that the present bill be amended so that the distribution of Federal funds be made through the United States Office of Education and the proper State educational channels.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES L. ROSE,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Santa Fe, January 18, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Please accept my thanks for the copy of S. 81, proposed jointly by you and Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

I was greatly impressed with the full provision of the bill.

You and your colleague are to be congratulated and highly commended for presenting a measure which would aid education by supplementing the salaries of teachers in free public elementary and secondary school.

The teaching professior has suffered a great loss on account of inadequate salaries for teachers. New Mexico particularly would benefit by Senate bill 81, and if the New Mexico office of education can serve you in the best interest of education, command us.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES L. ROSE,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE
OF NEW YORK,
STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
Albany, February 13, 1947.

The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I am sorry not to have been able to reply more promptly to your letter of January 10, in which you asked me to comment on S. 81, "To assist the States in improving and maintaining their systems of free public education by providing funds to be used for supplementing teachers' salaries."

I would say, first, that the purpose of the bill is thoroughly sound. The teacher situation is so bad as to call for drastic and long-range measures as a means of attracting and holding in the teaching profession the kind of teachers this country needs. I believe that Federal support for public education is essential if adequate educational opportunity is to be made available to all the Nation's youth.

Despite my approval of its purposes, however, I do have certain reservations concerning the measure which you have proposed. The fact that it makes no distinction in aid between the very wealthy and the very poor community, or between the relative financial resources of the several States, seems to me a serious defect. A further defect appears in the provision by which aid is granted directly to local school districts, thus offering little or no incentive or opportunity for coordinated planning by State departments of education on a State-wide basis. Furthermore, while emergency legislation limited to one or two years may be justified by the seriousness of the present situation, it would seem desirable that the Federal Government avoid special or earmarked grants which tend to control the pattern of education.

In brief, I hope it may be possible for the Federal Congress to recognize the current crisis in public education by the enactment of legislation which will provide an adequate minimum foundation program for all children, which will encourage constructive planning by State education departments without earmarking funds for restricted purposes, and which will recognize the need for equalization of educational opportunity among the several States and the local communities.

Thank you for bringing the bill to my attention.

Sincerely yours,
FRANCIS T. SPAULDING.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Raleigh, February 7, 1947.

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I have read with a great deal of care a copy of S. 81 which you so kindly forwarded to my office. I think the purpose of your bill is a most commendable one and I think that Federal aid is certainly essential in meeting the crisis in public education which exists at this time. I would suggest, however, that some mention be made in the bill of the administrative responsibility of State departments of education in order that the funds may be cleared in the State in a legal and effective manner.

I would also suggest a conference with Dr. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, with reference to the features having to do with administration at the national level. I think each one of the State superintendents is keenly aware of the need for funds from some source with which to meet the great crisis in education which we now face. I think all of us would be grateful if, through the instrumentality of Federal legislation, we could secure substantial funds with which to undergird our State school systems.

With best wishes, I am,
Very truly yours,
CLYDE A. ERWIN,
State Superintendent,
Public Instruction.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Bismarck, N. Dak., January 20, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Many thanks for your thoughtfulness in sending me a copy of S. 81. This bill appears to be sound and from my brief reading of the bill it appears to be the best of its kind that has been sent out to date. Should you be successful in passing this bill, it will be a great aid to the school districts of the Nation, and I assure you that it would be very beneficial and helpful to the school districts of North Dakota as well as a great boon and aid to the teachers of North Dakota.

We shall be very happy to hear of the progress of this bill.

Sincerely yours,
G. B. NORDRUM,
Superintendent.

STATE OF OHIO,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Columbus, January 16, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: This note is to express appreciation to you for sending me a copy of Senate bill 81.

I shall discuss the bill with some of the superintendents in Ohio who may stop at this office, and if they have any suggestions for improvement in the bill you may expect to hear from us.

Yours very truly,
CLYDE HISSONG.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Salem, Oreg., January 21, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 13 with which you inclosed a copy of S. 81.

Certainly something drastic must be done quickly in the way of increasing teachers' salaries in order to keep our public education program from suffering irreparable losses, if not completely collapsing, and S. 81 seems to be a step in the right direction.

I note that the various State departments of education are not mentioned in the measure, and thus I assume they have no function in the administration of the program. If this is the case, it would be my position that it should be amended to meet this possible objection. Further, it is my own personal opinion that State departments of education should not be given responsibilities by an act of the Congress unless sufficient funds are made available from the Federal level to meet those responsibilities.

It would be my suggestion that you confer with Dr. J. W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, about the matter.

Please accept my thanks for this opportunity to see and comment upon the measure.

Sincerely yours,
REX PUTNAM,
Superintendent, Public Instruction.

GOVERNMENT OF PUERTO RICO,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
San Juan, January 24, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I have read with deep interest the copy of S. 81 introduced by you and Senator MCGRATH in the Senate, which I received with your communication of January 13.

My reaction is decidedly in favor of this measure which provides liberally for assisting the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in improving and maintaining their systems of free public education. There is no doubt in my mind that the same reaction will be true all over the Nation, especially in the educational field.

Particularly as to Puerto Rico, with its overcrowded school system and with nearly 50 percent of its population of school age out of school, this piece of legislation when enacted would amount to a blessing. The estimated school population of the Island is at present a little over 600,000, of which only 350,000 are enrolled in elementary and secondary schools. Worse than that, approximately 72 percent of the number enrolled are receiving education practically on a ration plan. This is due to the fact that the same proportion of our schools are being run on a double enrollment or interlocking organization, for lack of financial resources to provide full educational facilities for all school children.

The bill as written will effectively meet our problem and will result in substantial aid to Puerto Rico. I have but commendatory words for your magnificent gesture in bringing this national problem before Congress for consideration.

Sincerely yours,
MARIANO VILLARONGA,
Commissioner of Education.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
Providence, R. I., January 17, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senator from Rhode Island, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I have received your kind letter of January 13, together with a copy of S. 81. May I take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate you upon such a proposal. I believe it is the only kind of legislation which will solve an immediate problem throughout the country; and if such legislation is passed, as director of Education in Rhode Island I would be certainly pleased, in behalf of the teachers of the State.

I do not know whether there is anything worth while in the following thought, or not; but I am at least going to pass it on. There is one difficulty, however, and that is the formulation of proper legislation to care for the matter.

One of our greatest difficulties, outside of the low salaries that all teachers receive, is the big differentiation that exists, between the beginning teacher, and the one of experience. Giving the same amount of money to each teacher, although perfectly splendid, nevertheless does nothing to help eliminate this great existing difference. If in some way this money, when received back in the various cities and towns, could be first used to bring the minimum salary of all teachers up to $1,800, and then allow the remainder to be added to the present salary of each teacher, I think that we would be placing the money where there is the greatest need. Undoubtedly a teacher in the higher brackets would not agree with me. Such a proposal as this would supply the funds to every teacher of the State of California where the present minimum is $2,400. In those States wherein the maximum is probably not even $1,800, such a proposal would benefit every teacher. But in those States, especially where the minimum today is even less than the present minimum of twelve hundred in Rhode Island, it would certainly help where I think there is the greatest need, for undoubtedly not the greatest noise.

If you think there is anything in the thought, and would care to develop it further, I should be very glad to confer with you again with regard to it.

Again, hearty congratulations and best wishes to both you and Senator MCGRATH, with regard to all you are doing to help the teacher's plight, not only in Rhode Island, but throughout the country.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES F. ROCKETT,
Director of Education.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Pierre, January 18, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senator, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: My first impression of S. 81 is highly favorable. I am inclined to feel it is the best of the numerous aid bills I have read.

Very sincerely yours,
J. F. HINES,
State Superintendent.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Nashville, Tenn., March 22, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE F. GREEN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Under date of January 13 I received a letter from you and a copy of S. 81. In your letter you requested comments, additions, omissions, or changes that might be desired in S. 81. I replied to your letter under date of January 24, and stated that our great need for Federal aid in Tennessee was toward the construction of public-school buildings. I further stated that our legislature, which was in session at that time, would give us an increased appropriation for teachers' salaries that would give our public-school teachers at least a reasonable salary. The legislature increased the salaries of public-school teachers in Tennessee from $300 to $800 per year, depending on the training and experience of the teacher.

Since writing you on January 24 I have again looked over S. 81, and I note that the grants authorized under this act for teachers' salaries are to be direct payments from the Federal Treasury to local school units or districts in the State. This plan completely bypasses the chief school officer of the State and the State department of education. It is my opinion that school funds from any source going to local school units should be handled through regular channels.

The bill further proposes $15 per pupil in average daily attendance in free public elementary and secondary schools within the jurisdiction of a district, and this amount to be used exclusively for teachers' salaries without regard to relative need. In Tennessee the need is much greater in some sections of the State than it is in others.

This letter is to call your attention to two things: First, that the bill bypasses school authorities on the State level, and, second, that it proposes a flat grant per pupil to be used exclusively for teachers' salaries without regard to relative need.

Yours truly,
BURGIN E. DOSSETT,
Commissioner.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Nashville, January 24, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: I have your letter of January 13; also a copy of Senate bill 81. In substance this bill allows $15 per capita in average daily attendance to the local school unit for supplementing the salaries of classroom teachers.

In Tennessee we are in favor of legislation to increase the salaries of teachers. Our greatest efforts at the present time are along lines of increasing teachers salaries, and it is my opinion that we will pass State legislation during this term of the legislature, which is now in session, that will give our public school teachers at least a reasonable salary.

We are in need of Federal aid in this State toward public-school buildings. It would be a great help to us if the Federal Government would work out a plan of aid along this line.

Very truly yours,
BURGIN E. DOSSETT,
Commissioner.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Austin, Tex., January 23, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I have read S. 81 with a great deal of interest. Since this bill has been placed in the hopper, I can see no particular reason why I should oppose it.

The thing that the States always dread is the strings which are placed upon such Federal assistance either in the act itself or through the Bureau which administers it.

Sincerely yours,
L. A. WOODS,
State Superintendent.

STATE OF VERMONT,
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Statehouse, Montpelier, January 15, 1947.

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Thank you for your letter of January 13 and S. 81, which I shall consider in connection with our teacher-salary problem. If there is a subsequent recommendation from the State board of education, I would appreciate the privilege of communicating with you, as you suggest.

Very sincerely yours,
RALPH E. NOBLE,
Commissioner of Education.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
VIRGIN ISLANDS OF THE UNITED STATES,
St. Thomas, February 25, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE F. GREEN,
Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: Thank you for your letter of January 15, 1947, and the copy of S. 81, which I have read with interest. It is noted that the term "State" is defined to include the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, but fails to include the Virgin Islands. It is presumed that this omission may not have been intentional and hoped that this measure if enacted would specifically provide for inclusion of the Virgin Islands in its benefits.

One of the principal difficulties encountered in our efforts to improve our school system is due to our inability to provide better salaries for teachers. Few of our young people completing high school in the Virgin Islands choose to enter the teaching profession, because of the low pay, and recently we have lost many of our abler teachers, who have left our service to take more lucrative positions in other fields. It will be found, also, that the average salary of teachers in the Virgin Islands is decidedly below the average for the United States, and below the average in other United States possessions, despite the relatively high cost of living here.

Sincerely yours,
C. FREDERICK DIXON,
Superintendent of Education.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Richmond, February 18, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Several weeks ago you sent me a copy of S. 81, which you introduced in the Senate on January 8 for your self and Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

I note that this bill provides for an appropriation of Federal funds for teachers' salaries direct to the school districts. The term "public-school district" is defined as "a district, town, or other local governmental subdivision having the supervision of public schools within its jurisdiction." It seems to me that this definition should be clarified by including the words "city" and "county," since in Virginia and in many of the other Southern States the county is the unit for school administration and finances. In Virginia, in only rare instances, there are separate school districts for administering and financing the public-school system.

My frank reaction to the proposal in the bill is that it is a serious mistake to provide funds direct from the Federal Government to a school district. It does not appear to me to be logical or sound to bypass the State Department of Education which is responsible for the administration and supervision of all of the schools of the State. Therefore,

I object seriously to the bill on the grounds that the funds should be appropriated directly to the United States Office of Education and distributed by it to the State departments of education, which could then distribute it to the counties, cities, or separate school districts within each State.

With best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

G. TYLER MILLER,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Charleston, January 21, 1947.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I have just read Senate bill 81, which was introduced in the Senate Wednesday, January 8, sponsored by you and Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH. I think it is well worded and that it merits favorable action by the Senate. I shall write the Senators from West Virginia in behalf of the bill.

I have but one suggestion. I would delete from line 2, page 5, the three words "the supervision or." Lines 1 and 2 would then read "instruction, but does not include persons engaged solely in the administration of instruction."

If I can be of further assistance please call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. TRENT,
State Superintendent of Free Schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. In connection with the vote, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. GREEN's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL obtained the floor.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts permit the third reading of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

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

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have had an interesting experience in connection with this bill in the number and kind of letters and telegrams I have received. It leaves me apparently perfectly free to use my own judgment. The religious groups have been uniformly against the educational bill, and other groups have been uniformly in favor of it, leaving me in a balanced state of mind. However, in coming to my own conclusions, there is a question which I should like to ask. I have been for many years convinced that raising the general level of education is a Federal responsibility, particularly for States whose resources and available State funds are below the amount which would enable them to provide a better standard. I am disturbed, however, as I read the bill, because of the manner in which the funds are to be allocated, if I correctly understand the allocation.

I wish to inquire of the sponsors whether it is true that when a State has met the minimum requirements and the allocation, the condition exists that from that point on there is no particular incentive for the State to take up a larger share of the total burden. Does it not from that point on rest securely, serenely, and presently in the arms of the Federal Government?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. In general the States which need the money most, apart from the $5 question, are required to put up 2 percent of the income of their people for education, which is more than the average throughout the United States. They are not required to do it all at once; they are given approximately 4 years in which to reach that point. They have not reached it, but they have that incentive to reach it. After that, if they have not reached 2½ percent, the Federal contribution is proportionately reduced, so that in order to get their full share of the Federal contribution they have the incentive to raise their own tax revenues to a point where they amount to approximately 2½ percent of the income, which is about as high as any State goes today and very much above the general average.

Mr. FLANDERS. Does the Senator from Ohio feel assured that there is nothing in the bill which tends to relax the support of education by the States in view of the Federal support?

Mr. TAFT. No; I think there is absolutely nothing. The States are forced up to 2 percent, and there is a substantial incentive to make it 2½ percent, which point none of them has yet reached. If they ever shall reach it, it is probably as much as the States could ever be expected to reach, because under our present tax system it is very difficult for a State to raise from the total income of the State more than approximately 6 percent in taxes. That is approximately where it is today. It can be pushed a little bit higher, but not much higher. Under those circumstances a State can hardly hope to spend more than 2½ percent, which would be a good deal more than one-third of its total revenues, simply for elementary and secondary school purposes.

So I think I can answer the Senator, with full confidence, that there is nothing in the bill which would in any way relax the efforts of the States to do their job toward a full education.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a moment in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Ohio may have explained this matter when I was not on the floor, but will he be kind enough to state whether or not on page 15 of the bill, in lines 21 and 22, the term "annual income payments for each State as determined by the Department of Commerce" has been defined. What is the exact meaning of the expression?

Mr. TAFT. It is defined by the Department of Commerce. If the Senator would like me to put something into the RECORD on that subject, I have here a Survey of Current Business, which, as the Senator knows, is issued by the Department of Commerce and is based largely on statistics gathered by that Department. On page 14 of the August 1947 issue, there is set forth a detailed explanation of what the total income payments for each State amount to and how they are derived. I should be glad to insert it in the RECORD at this point, if that is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. I should be glad if the Senator would do that.

May I ask a further question? Is there any definition in the statutes or in any regulations as to what the term "annual income payments for each State as determined by the Department of Commerce" means, or is that a term which the Department might itself change so that we would have an uncertain measure in this bill?

Mr. TAFT. I think the Department of Commerce might change it. The Department has recently changed the general concept of gross profit, gross income, and total income payments of individuals, but they have now defined it in a very clear way for the Nation as a whole, and the State definition conforms to it. So, while it might be possible for the Department to change it, it could only do so for very definite statistical reasons, and it would be only for the purpose of making the concept a clearer one. I think the concept is perfectly clear. It is the sum of the income of all individuals in a particular State.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement to which I have referred, from the Survey of Current Business, issued by the Department of Commerce, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

Estimates of total income payments to individuals for each State are derived as the summation of a very large number of separately estimated components. The following statement, which necessarily omits considerable detail, affords a brief description of the principal sources of data used in the derivation of State estimates for each of the four broad types of income payments defined above. Uniform sources and methods are utilized for all States.

Wages and salaries, which for the Nation are more than three-fifths of all income, are among the types of income for which data are most complete and reliable. They are estimated by States in considerable industrial detail. For most industries they are derived from reports of the Bureau of the Census and of the Social Security Administration. In the preparation of estimates for

1939 and subsequent years, heavy reliance was placed on wage data compiled by the Social Security Administration from tabulations by the State unemployment compensation agencies of reports received from all covered employers. For each State these tabulations include a summary of the total amount of wages, classified by detailed industry groups, actually paid out by establishments located in the State. The unemployment compensation wage data were supplemented by special tabulations of the Social Security Administration furnishing data on wages in the very small-sized firms excluded from unemployment insurance coverage by the varying size-of-firm provisions of the State laws. These tabulations were compiled from wage data filed by employers under the old-age and survivors insurance program, which includes all-sized establishments within covered employment. Supplementation of the unemployment compensation wage data by the old-age and survivors insurance wage data yields a complete measure of wages and salaries paid out by all establishments in covered industries. On a Nation-wide basis, wages and salaries in covered industries in 1946 constituted three-fourths of all civilian wages and salaries and nearly one-half of all income payments to individuals.

State estimates of wages and salaries are prepared for each of the several industries, or types of employment, not covered by social security laws. These include agriculture, Federal, State, and local government agencies; railroads; domestic service; maritime industries; and nonprofit religious, charitable, scientific, and educational agencies. Data used in the formulation of estimates for these categories are obtained, for the most part, from Federal agencies. For example, estimates of wages paid to hired farm laborers are secured from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture. Wage-and-salary payments by governmental agencies are based on data supplied by the Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, Bureau of the Census, Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency, and the War and Navy Departments.

Estimates of Government wages and salaries are made separately for the executive, judicial, legislative, and military branches of the Federal Government, and for the school and nonschool groups of employees of State and local governments. Pay of the armed forces, net of their contributions to allowances and allotments going to their dependents, is allocated by States in terms of their State of duty. This allocation is made separately for each of the four military services and is based on monthly or quarterly data by States on numbers of officers and of enlisted personnel stationed in each State and on average rates of pay for the two groups of personnel.

Proprietors' income may be divided for purposes of this discussion into net income of farm operators and net income of nonfarm proprietors. State estimates of the net income of farm operators are derived by deducting from farmers' gross income during the calendar year their total expenses of production. Gross income includes cash income from marketing of crops and livestock, Government payments, the value of products consumed on the farm, and the value (positive or negative) of the change in inventories of crops and livestock. The total of production expenses is a summation of 34 separately estimated items. Data on which the income and expenditures data are based are those of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. It should be noted that products consumed on farms are valued at farm prices. For some purposes, particularly those related to "welfare" comparisons, valuation at retail prices might be preferable.

The total net income of proprietors in nonagricultural industries is prepared by States for each major industry division. The geographic distribution of these components of total income payments is based mainly on reports of the Bureau of the Census, including reports of both the industrial and population censuses. Pending the availability of more complete information from Census enumerations, year-to-year alterations of the State distributions derived for the census year 1939 were based for each industry on a relevant measure such as volume of sales or wage-and-salary payments.

National estimates of dividends, interest, and net rents and royalties are distributed by States primarily on the basis of tabulations by the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the amounts of those items reported by individuals on Federal income-tax returns. Exceptions to this general procedure are the separate estimation of net rents received by farmer landlords (from data of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics) and, for 1942–46, of Federal interest payments to individuals.

For most of the numerous individual components of the category of "other" income payments, State and National data represent actual disbursements, as reported by Federal agencies. Types of income for which data on disbursement by States are available from official reports include public assistance and other relief, retirement and unemployment insurance benefits under the social security and railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance programs, and veterans' pensions and benefits. For two other items of this category—workmen's compensation and retirement payments by State and local governments—estimates are supplied by the Social Security Administration as a product of its studies of social insurance and related payments. Data on State bonus payments to veterans of World War II were furnished by the individual State governments.

The War and Navy Departments report disbursements for the country as a whole for mustering-out payments, military allowances, and enlisted men's cash terminal-leave payments. Additionally, they supply requisite data for estimating the amounts of these disbursements received by residents of the various States. Such data include a tabulation by the War Department of the actual amount of family-allowance payments received in each State during June 1944, annual data on military separations by State of residence, and annual data on the number of military personnel according to State of residence.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly in favor of the pending bill concerning Federal aid to education. I do so because my opinion on Federal assistance to State school systems has changed materially during the past 5 years. As Governor of Massachusetts I believed sincerely in the concept of complete State responsibility for our public schools. I still believe—even more firmly than ever before—in this State responsibility. I believe in absolute freedom of education, and would be the first to oppose this bill if I thought for one moment that it would jeopardize this freedom. But I do want to help to improve the opportunity for education of our young people. I believe this bill will help to do this, particularly in certain sections of our country where more education of boys and girls can help us all.

The global picture has drastically changed during the past 5 years. New methods of transportation and communications have brought closer together nations thousands of miles apart. Peace and war hang in delicate balance. We must thoroughly exploit every road to peace.

I believe the ultimate hope for lasting peace rests upon our people's understanding of their personal responsibilities for winning and keeping this peace and security. I believe that the ultimate hope for sustaining and improving our system of government, which we know is the best man has yet devised, is that broad understanding which comes through sound, unshackled education. So the best possible training of our young people, like their health, is of primary importance to all of us today and a deep concern of Government.

The proper education of our youth always has been the key to keeping America free. President Conant of my own University of Harvard put it another way recently when he said, "Bear in mind the importance of first-class men with sound training. There is only one thing that can outmatch young men with good ideas and that is still younger men with better ideas."

Our Federal Government may well help our local authorities to provide more and better education by making available funds to "put a floor" under our school system, especially in areas where it is now substandard. But it must never attempt to control education. If there is to be aid, it should be brought only to the State boundaries. This bill does stop at the State boundaries. All administrative control should be left to the State authorities so that they will exercise their own initiative and feel direct responsbilities for the success of their own schools. This bill does insist upon local initiative and responsibility for the success of the schools. No law that does not guarantee this local responsibility should be considered by us. If freedom of education is lost, our foundation of freedom disappears overnight.

Our successful future, and confidence in our system of government, depends upon every boy and girl having a fair chance to develop to the maximum his or her potentialities. We give them this opportunity through our school system. Our school system is democratic in its nature and expresses our ideals in a practical way. It provides a ladder of opportunity for all. Through our school system we seek to educate all varieties of talent in each new generation. We are proud of the fact that we are doing this to a degree unrealized by any other nation. To the extent that our schools are inadequate, we fail to develop our greatest source of wealth—the youth of our country. If we are succesful in our school system, we enrich our Nation every year with men and women of trained intelligence and well-formed characters and thus make more secure the way of life in which we believe.

Today there is another compelling reason why the Federal Government may well give a helping hand to the education of our youth. We are a mobile people. The future citizens of some of the more wealthy communities are now being educated in the relatively poorer rural districts of our country.

In fact, the most recent census figure shows that 22½ percent, or over 30 millions, of our citizens were not born in States in which they are now living. In self-interest alone, therefore, it is to the

advantage of my Commonwealth of Massachusetts to participate in a program which will give a better education to an underprivileged farm boy in a district where the school facilities are inadequate.

I think the cartoon in the Washington Post of March 29 entitled "School Days" provides the best summarization of the problem that I have recently seen. Congress is pictured as sitting at a desk studying the aid-to-education bill. A small boy with a pointer is standing by a blackboard on which is written, "Two million children of school age attending no school, plus two million taught by unqualified teachers equals * * *".

I stated that I frankly have changed my mind in relation to the principle which underlies this legislation. I was supported in my earlier position by the former Massachusetts commissioner of education, Mr. Walter Downey, whom I appointed. I am glad to say that in consulting with him recently, I find that he feels as I do, that conditions in this country and in the world today have changed to such a degree that some Federal aid to education is now wise. I should like to quote from Mr. Downey's letter to me in this regard, because he is one of our most distinguished teachers and educators in Massachusetts. He said:

> I wish to say that I, for one, have now changed my attitude. By applying an analysis similar to that applied before, the world situation is so far changed that we must take every means of strengthening what we can properly recognize is one of our basic defenses in this country. * * * My opinion now is that we cannot spend any too much money in training the brains of America, and in seeing that all sections of the country are properly educated, regardless of either race or previous condition. I have changed my viewpoint as the times have made it necessary.

I may say that this also is the present view of Mr. Downey's successor as commissioner of education, who now holds a position of responsibility in the school system of Missouri.

This bill is before us because many States, with greatly limited sources of revenue, are finding it virtually impossible to maintain adequate standards in their school systems, as well as carry on other essential services demanded by their people. I am in hearty sympathy with the move to study tax sources for the Federal and State Governments. It is much needed. Today the Federal Government, partly because of the recent war, is tapping the most profitable sources of revenue on the local level. This has put the squeeze on the States. S. 472 attempts to meet this dilemma, and, in my opinion, it represents the best endeavor yet worked out to pass down financial assistance without strings attached. It resolves the various conflicting viewpoints by preserving States rights and local independence of education. This principle of States rights, in my opinion, must overshadow all other considerations if we want to maintain our system of government as we know it.

If we do not do something to help, we are going to leave many of our potential leaders uneducated and without the opportunity of giving us the benefit of their intelligent judgment. If we do take positive action we will be developing a greater understanding in this country of what our system of life means and thus show the other peoples in the world the real vitality of democracy in action."

We are not yet at peace. A battle for the minds of men is raging throughout the world. Our trump card in this insidious struggle is an educated and understanding American public. More and better education for our youth is the way to win that battle. That is the principal reason why I believe we should support this bill, in spite of all the apprehensions we may have and the additional expense that may be involved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as I must be absent from the Senate for the remainder of the day, and there probably will be a vote, I wish to announce my position on the bill. If I were present I would vote for the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that my reasons for supporting it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON ON S. 472

Mr. President, in the schoolhouses of America today are the scientists, the businessmen, the farmers, the statesmen—the citizens of tomorrow. How well each is equipped to assume the full responsibilities of citizenship—and all that word implies—will depend in no small measure upon the educational opportunity his particular community is able to provide.

The disparity between educational opportunity extended to youth in various communities of the Nation can be measured partially by the expenditures of each for public elementary and secondary education. Let me illustrate the existing disparity with an example. In 1944, Mississippi expended $48.04 per pupil in average daily attendance; Washington, $171.23. The State of Washington expended almost four times as much per pupil as Mississippi. It is true that learning cannot be purchased with dollars like wheat in the market place, but it is equally true that public education cannot be achieved without adequate financial support.

Generally speaking, those States least able to finance public education are making a satisfactory effort. In 1944, the State of Mississippi spent 1.99 percent of total income payments in support of elementary and secondary schools; the State of Washington, 1.78 percent. Mississippi expended over 33 percent of her tax revenues for this purpose; Washington 30 percent.

To me this brief comparison cuts to the heart of the problem. Some States of the Union simply do not have access to sufficient taxable wealth to finance public education on an American standard. These States must have Federal assistance. To achieve a degree of equalization, wealth must be taxed where it is and the revenues used where needed.

The principle of equalization of educational opportunity is not new. For many years individual States have recognized the urgent necessity of assisting those counties and school districts which, through circumstances beyond their control, are unable to finance an educational program of acceptable proportions. The State of Washington was among the first to recognize this responsibility. The progress we have made is evidenced by the fact that in 1944, 63 percent of the total financial support of public elementary and secondary education was provided from tax revenues collected by the State. Nationally only 33 percent of school support came from State sources. I believe passage of this bill will stimulate other States to greater effort in equalizing educational opportunity within their borders.

Numerous people have expressed the fear that Federal aid to education will bring in its wake Federal control. Personally, I do not share that fear. The bill now before us prohibits infringement by any Federal agency or official, upon the rights of the States to design and administer their own educational systems. Even if the language of the bill were less specific on this point, I would still have confidence in the stamina of the States to resist usurpation by the Federal Government of their proper prerogatives.

Some Members of the Senate have been critical of the fact that this bill provides for all States a minimum allocation of $5 per child, between the ages of 5 and 17. They argue that since the fundamental justification for the legislation is inability of some States to provide a minimum standard of education, only those States so situated should receive Federal aid. I recognize the partial validity of this reasoning. Such a conclusion, however, fails to note the tax limitations which many so-called wealthy States confront. In addition it implies satisfaction with the present level of educational opportunity afforded by those States which will receive the $5 minimum. The facts do not support this position. In practically every school in my State—and the State of Washington ranks high in funds expended for public education—there is overcrowding, lack of classroom equipment, inadequate library facilities, and too many pupils per teacher. The $1,800,000 allocation, provided under this bill, while not large in comparison to the total school budget, will assist in alleviating these conditions. Much more important, of course, is the $28.50 per pupil which will be allocated to the State of Mississippi.

BAREFOOT SCHOOLBOY LAW—OVER-ALL EDUCATION

I want to close with this thought. Democratic government in the final analysis rests upon the mental and physical strength of its people. Present day economic, political, and social problems cannot be solved by leadership alone. Under representative government, informed, intelligent followership is an indispensable part of the teamwork through which acceptable solutions are achieved.

Only by liberating and perfecting the intrinsic powers of every citizen can the central purpose of democracy be achieved. To the extent that this bill equalizes educational opportunity for every school child in America, it contributes to this fundamental objective.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should also like to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the superintendent of public instruction of the State of Washington.

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

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Olympia, March 25, 1948.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Our State equalization program is very similar to the apportionment formula contained in S. 472. A guaranteed minimum of $36 per child in average daily attendance is provided. If a 10-mill school district property tax will not produce this amount, the State supplements the proceeds of the local tax with sufficient funds to provide $36 per child in average daily attendance. This is similar to the proposed Federal apportionment plan. A guaranteed minimum of $45 per census child

is established. If 1 percent of the State's total income will not produce the $45 per child, then a supplementary payment is made by the Federal Government.

In addition to our State equalization program, the State apportions money to all school districts amounting to approximately $130 per child in average daily attendance. This means that every child in the State is guaranteed a school program costing at least $166 annually for current expenses. It is only by such an equalization program that we have been able to guarantee a good education to children living in the less wealthy areas of the State.

Our new equalization law was enacted in 1937. The wealthy school districts receive no State equalization funds, although they do receive some general aid apportioned to all school districts. The poorest districts receive equalization funds amounting to over $30 per child in average daily attendance. Seattle and Spokane receive no equalization funds, since they have a relatively large amount of taxable industrial property. Other cities, such as Bremerton, which has a large amount of Federal tax-exempt property (navy yard), receive relatively large amounts of State equalization funds.

The enclosed table shows the distribution of State school funds during the current year. Three counties—Adams, Garfield, and Lincoln—receive no equalization funds.

If you wish to go into the distribution of school funds in this State more completely, Dr. Frank W. Hubbard of the National Education Association has a brief statement of our school-support plan.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely.

PEARL A. WANAMAKER,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Table showing appropriations for the operation of the common schools in Washington

Biennium	Current school	County equalization	Special appropriation	Building	Total
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
1933-35	20,000,000				20,000,000
1935-37	30,560,475				30,560,475
1937-39	32,500,000	2,500,000			35,000,000
1939-41	34,500,000	2,500,000			37,000,000
1941-43	36,250,000	2,700,000	700,000	3,000,000	42,650,000
1943-45	45,600,000	3,600,000			49,200,000
1945-47	65,000,000	3,600,000	970,000	1,675,000	71,245,000
1947-49	95,555,962	4,800,000	800,000	8,500,000	109,655,962

NOTE.—Actual apportionments from the current school fund were as follows:

1933-35	$10,894,000.00
1935-37	25,378,401.82
1937-39	25,906,966.28
1939-41	33,782,799.00
1941-43	36,250,000.00
1943-45	45,600,000.00
1945-47	65,000,000.00

Source: Session laws for indicated years.

Allotment of State current school funds for school year 1947-48

County	Column 18, equalization	Column 19, transportation	Column 20, attendance	Column 25, educational unit	Column 27, levy deduction	Column 28, total allotment
Adams		$42,075.65	$61,882.50	$96,600.00		$200,558.15
Asotin	$42,121.35	13,398.16	102,165.30	109,200.00		266,884.81
Benton	152,917.97	42,907.26	364,190.40	364,896.00		924,911.63
Chelan	159,390.14	43,303.49	465,896.40	436,912.00		1,105,502.03
Clallam	72,992.03	36,877.71	247,256.70	246,092.00		603,218.44
Clark	389,286.46	91,314.03	896,864.10	893,942.00		2,271,406.59
Columbia	484.48	8,859.12	48,061.20	63,448.00		120,852.80
Cowlitz	200,889.39	60,452.40	561,294.00	515,144.00		1,337,779.79
Douglas	24,184.07	26,636.29	72,857.40	103,544.00		227,221.76
Ferry	32,747.94	23,052.94	39,821.70	53,816.00		149,438.58
Franklin	15,955.24	19,849.06	96,504.90	101,360.00		233,669.20
Garfield		20,523.31	28,658.70	36,400.00		85,582.01
Grant	49,141.15	41,991.17	152,385.30	182,560.00		426,077.62
Grays Harbor	214,903.27	65,675.42	534,249.00	533,960.00		1,348,787.69
Island	32,314.67	14,328.44	63,138.90	70,420.00		180,202.01
Jefferson	35,779.94	21,276.26	92,407.80	100,800.00		250,264.00
King	528,237.10	220,240.19	5,154,591.00	4,768,918.00		10,671,986.29
Kitsap	372,381.97	109,491.16	923,568.60	870,870.00		2,276,311.73
Kittitas	19,167.80	37,926.82	208,413.30	228,312.00		493,819.92
Klickitat	28,522.29	33,398.96	114,627.60	142,800.00	−$642.33	318,706.52
Lewis	112,729.09	86,786.41	473,532.00	458,794.00		1,131,841.50
Lincoln		67,302.93	112,988.40	168,322.00		348,613.33
Mason	78,724.11	44,650.03	145,907.10	148,540.00		417,821.24
Okanogan	173,386.21	78,076.45	320,378.40	344,960.00		916,801.06
Pacific	55,046.18	36,293.95	163,840.20	183,204.00		438,384.33
Pend Oreille	32,223.82	22,352.21	74,840.70	86,996.00		216,412.73
Pierce	494,660.63	93,976.55	1,984,297.20	1,846,040.00		4,418,974.38
San Juan	20,944.63	7,362.62	27,111.60	42,546.00	−154.75	97,810.10
Skagit	122,016.77	60,053.80	427,414.20	415,310.00		1,024,794.77
Skamania	13,075.48	10,410.78	37,753.20	45,108.00		106,347.46
Snohomish	374,812.56	112,271.14	1,112,755.20	1,055,460.00		2,655,298.90
Spokane	131,623.57	103,429.06	1,751,437.20	1,630,286.00		3,616,775.83
Stevens	113,138.18	68,827.70	193,193.70	238,420.00		613,579.58
Thurston	109,137.92	58,765.91	389,997.00	371,210.00		929,110.83
Wahkiakum	11,630.42	8,814.06	29,797.20	33,600.00		83,841.68
Walla Walla	4,610.73	33,264.60	262,014.30	295,358.00	−16,302.82	578,944.81
Whatcom	146,526.45	79,061.56	619,181.70	598,066.00		1,442,835.71
Whitman	2,341.30	109,014.69	257,799.00	344,400.00		713,554.99
Yakima	614,162.35	107,881.11	1,324,864.20	1,155,126.00		3,202,033.66
Total	4,982,207.66	2,162,173.40	19,937,937.30	19,381,740.00	−17,099.90	46,446,958.46

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the pending bill, if enacted, will start a new Federal subsidy to the States. It begins with an annual appropriation of Federal funds of $300,000,000 for public education, but it opens up a Pandora's box of Federal spending which will increase as the years go on and will, I predict, be greater in time than the grand total of all the present Federal subsidies to the States.

Never in our history has there been a more unpropitious time for the Federal Government to enter into a long-range proposition such as is proposed in the pending legislation. Today the Federal Government is confronted with the greatest expenditures in time of peace ever contemplated in our history, and these vast expenditures will be certain to continue for many, many years. World War II ended not quite 3 years ago, but today this Nation is rearming at a cost which may stagger the financial solvency of America. I predict that within a space of 2 years the Federal budget will reach a total of at least $50,000,000,000 annually, and perhaps more. The recommendations of the President for military costs, for expenditure in the next fiscal year, are now $15,000,000,000, with more to come. This includes only $400,000,000 for universal military training and the companion expenditure for the National Guard. The total of these expenditures when this program, if enacted by the Congress, is in full operation will be $4,000,000,000, so that within 2 years the military expenditures will reach a minimum of $20,000,000,000.

We have entered into a program of foreign aid which will take from the Federal Treasury from $8,000,000,000 to $9,000,000,000 annually. The interest on the public debt is $5,000,000,000, the cost of caring for the veterans is now $7,000,000,000, and not likely to be reduced, so that the total of these expenses, which can be considered as fixed for many years to come, will approximate $39,000,000,000 to $40,000,000,000. To this must be added $12,000,000,000 of ordinary expenses of government, which makes a total of approximately $50,000,000,000. It is, of course, possible, by rigid and drastic economy, to reduce the ordinary expenses of government, but even then the total will not be very far from $50,000,000,000.

This will place the severest strain upon the business economy of America that we have ever experienced, because no longer can we depend upon deficit financing. With a debt of $255,000,000,000, as we now have, continuing deficits for current expenditures will shake our financial structure to its very foundation. This money—this $50,000,000,000, which I predict will be the budget within 2 years—must be raised by annual taxation and will place a burden upon the private-enterprise system of America such as we have never experienced before in time of peace.

Let us never forget that the strength of America is in a strong and virile system of free enterprise, which is not possible if the taxes are so burdensome as to destroy the initiative and the prospect of profit of those from whose business operations the Government must obtain its funds to pay its costs. These colossal expenditures may require a regimentation of our economy equal to that which now exists in England and which has virtually destroyed the freedom of the individual in that country. The most sacred responsibility we have is to preserve here at home the principles of free democratic government and a solvent nation, because once the democracy of America falls, then it is not likely that anywhere in the world free government will be established for centuries to come.

This is certainly not a time to expand Federal expenditures in a new field, but it is a time to conserve all of our resources to meet the financial strain of the days to come.

On October 14, 1943, the very able and distinguished Senator from Ohio—and I am sorry he is not now on the floor—who is the patron of the pending legislation to establish this Federal subsidy, filed with the Senate a minority report for himself, the late Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from

Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], in opposition to the then pending Senate bill 637, which likewise provided for a Federal subsidy for schools. Some of the provisions of that bill and the pending bill are different, yet the subsidy principle is the same. In fact, Senate bill 637, proposed in 1943, at least had the merit of giving assistance only to those States presumed to be in need, while the pending bill gives assistance to all States. This report by the very able Senator from Ohio is so forceful, as are all of his utterances, that I am going to take the liberty to read to the Senate some of its sections as relating to the general principle of Federal subsidies to local education.

I shall begin with that part of the report relating to the ultimate cost of this policy. The report, as I have said, Mr. President, was filed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on October 14, 1943, on behalf of himself, the late Senator Walsh from Massachusetts, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The subsection which relates to the cost is headed:

This—

Speaking of the Federal subsidy—

is the start of a revolutionary policy which may cost $4,000,000,000.

I am now reading from the report prepared by the Senator from Ohio.

Apart from the nonexistent emergency feature, the Federal subsidy project has been before Congress for a number of years, promoted by the National Education Association and the Federal Office of Education, but not by the States themselves. Previous bills have been based entirely on the principle of equalization, and have all been based on the argument that because some States spend much less money per pupil than others, the way to improve education is to subsidize those States.

The whole project—

Said the Senator from Ohio—

is based on the assumption that the more money is spent on education, the better the education is. This conclusion is perhaps open to question. Startling ignorance regarding American history, which was discussed in the Senate last spring, certainly could not arise from lack of financial resources. It appeared among students from all over the United States, and in many instances from students who came from those States which spend the most money on education. Undoubtedly education in some States is handicapped by lack of funds, but there are other ways in which American education can be improved besides granting Federal subsidies.

The adoption of the present bill would undoubtedly embark the Federal Government in a gradually increasing expenditure from which it would never be relieved. If we once pay from two hundred to three hundred dollars of the salary of every school teacher in the country, how can we possibly ever withdraw that support? Even if the States become richer, they will never be willing to take over this burden. Having yielded once to a very strong pressure, there will be no way in which to prevent a further yielding.

The desires of the educators—

Said the Senator from Ohio in 1943—

are almost without limit. The whole question of Federal aid to education is discussed in the report of the National Resources Planning Board for 1943, on page 68. That report takes the position that "the Nation is now spending less than 50 percent of the amount needed to provide a justifiable minimum educational program." Current expenditures and capital outlay for education in the United States are shown to be approximately $3,200,000,000. The "justifiable minimum annual expenditures in the postwar period" are said (by the report) to be $7,385,000,000."

* * * * *

This report was written by Dr. Floyd W. Reeves, who is also chairman of the Advisory Committee on Education, closely allied with the National Education Association and the original promoter of subsidy legislation. We see, therefore—

Said the Senator from Ohio in 1943—

that the real program of which this is the beginning calls for the Federal Government to finance the greater part of the $4,000,000,000 a year.

This proposal is in fact the beginning of a revolutionary change in one of our most fundamental Government activities. It should not be considered except in relation to the entire postwar activities of the Federal Government.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The Senator has just reminded us that in 1943 the senior Senator from Ohio predicted that if we started with an initial appropriation of $300,000,000, we would see the time when it would be increased 10 times. Does not the Senator think that is a conservative estimate, in the light of the fact that in 1917 we started with an initial appropriation of $5,000,000 for public roads, and increased it a hundred times? We are now appropriating $500,000,000 for grants-in-aid to public roads.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with my colleague that this opens a Pandora's box, as I have said, for public spending.

As I have said, in 1943 the Senator from Ohio predicted that the Federal Government would be called upon to finance the greater part of the additional $4,000,000,000 required by the report of the Resources Planning Board in 1943, page 68.

I wish to read another section of this report, because the report, prepared by the Senator from Ohio, is the most forceful argument that has been made against a Federal subsidy for schools that I have ever read. I should like to read from that portion of the report under the heading "We should not now commit the Federal Government to any new type of expense." Let us recall that when the Senator from Ohio prepared the report the Federal debt was $165,000,000,000. It is now $255,000,000,000. The report says:

We should not now commit the Federal Government to any new type of expense. The Federal Government faces after the war—

The war was then in progress—

a tremendously serious financial problem. The annual charge for interest alone will amount to $5,000,000,000. At least $5,000,000,000 will be necessary for the armed forces.

We are now asked by the President to spend in this year $15,000,000,000 for the armed services, and four or five billion dollars more will be necessary if universal military training is approved.

The report continued:

At least $5,000,000,000 will be required for existing services.

We are spending $12,000,000,000 for what the Senator from Ohio calls "existing services."

Many other new items of expense will be clamoring for consideration. We do not know where the point is, but there is a point at which the burden of government will become so great that it will choke all incentive, initiative, and enterprise. At some point we can kill the goose that lays the golden egg and force the entire country into a socialistic strait-jacket.

That was what the Senator from Ohio said in 1943 with respect to the same principle which is proposed in this bill, a Federal subsidy for schools.

It seems most unwise to commit ourselves now to any policy which will increase the difficulty of the postwar problem. If expenditures for education are to be undertaken, they should be undertaken when we have the whole problem before us, and can consider the relative merits of each proposal in relation to the over-all expense.

There is an even more important question. Can Federal subsidies to the public-school system be maintained without ultimately bringing about the nationalization of our educational facilities and federalized bureaucratic control? This is an eventuality which the proponents of the present bill insist is not intended and which they maintain can be avoided.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the vital point in this legislation, which I cannot escape. I keep turning it over in my mind. I should like to ask the able Senator from Virginia a question. I wish to compliment him for the very studious reports and statistics he gives us, because we know that they are authentic. We know that his statistics present the facts to us in a way which is inescapable.

Regardless of the restrictions written into section 2 of the bill, which I think probably are written with as much force and effect as restrictions could be written, so far as concerns keeping the processes within the States themselves, I ask the able Senator this question: Should the Congress of the United States appropriate money to the States or any other agencies, unless it has control? Control should be maintained, should it not?

Mr. BYRD. I do not believe that the guaranties in the bill, to the effect that it will be a home-rule bill, are worth the paper on which they are written. There is no way by which one Congress can guarantee that future Congresses will not change what has been done. All that would be required would be a majority vote on the part of the House and the Senate, and every provision of the law could be changed at any time. So there is no assurance, no guaranty.

There is the further fact that there is not a single Federal subsidy today which is not controlled by the Federal Government so far as the manner and method of its expenditure are concerned.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then it is the Senator's feeling, is it not, that no matter what the bill provides, even though we may, for the sake of argument, agree that it meets the point which I have raised, yet we cannot bind a succeeding Congress on the question of subsidies and contributions? In future years there is danger of the nationalization of the school system by the Federal Government.

Mr. BYRD. I think there is a certainty that sooner or later, if this bill is enacted, the Congress of the United States will direct how this money is to be spent. Of course, the localities or the States could refuse the money. That is true; but Senators who have been governors of their States know, as the former Governor of Maryland, Mr. O'CONOR, knows, that once the money has been integrated into the finances of a State, the denial to the State of such large sums of money would create a very dangerous and difficult situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Then it is my understanding that, regardless of the guaranties in the bill itself, there can be no assurance that there will be no attempt by the Federal Government to nationalize the school system, or to control or dictate the expenditure of the money. Is it the feeling of the Senator that regardless of what the provisions of this bill might be, the administration of the fund would depend upon succeeding Congresses so far as future provisions are concerned? As I understand, it is the Senator's feeling that there is implicit in every subsidy the idea that there should be some control, and that the Federal Government can step into the picture.

Mr. BYRD. I certainly think so.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I wish to invite the attention of the senior Senator from Virginia to one phase of the question of the Senator from Nebraska which escaped his attention. Does the Senator from Virginia know of any Federal aid to the States in the past or in the present which has been granted free of all Federal control?

Mr. BYRD. To my knowledge there is not a single example of Federal aid which is not accompanied by a direction from the Federal Government as to the manner in which the fund shall be expended. I have a list of them, in eight separate categories.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have listened very patiently to the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio to the effect that section 2 provides the guarantees which place this aid in an entirely different category from other examples of Federal aid which has already been granted. In order to get the point of the distinguished Senator absolutely clear in my mind, I propounded this question to him: Regardless of the fact that we might agree that section 2 does exactly what is claimed for it, nevertheless, does the distinguished Senator feel that in years to come, under the theory that in every type of Federal aid there is an implied control, it will be our duty to see to it that the money of the Federal Government is used for the purposes for which it is allocated?

Mr. BYRD. I think there is a great deal in that argument; but what I wish to make clear is that section 2 gives no guaranty. It purports to give a guaranty, but gives no guaranty, and can be changed by a majority vote of the House and Senate tomorrow, the next day, or at any time Congress chooses to act. There is no way by which a guaranty can be given for future years.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, any legislation which is enacted by one Congress is subject to revision, modification, or repeal by a succeeding Congress. Let me ask the Senator from Virginia this question: I understand the ideal which the Senator has in mind with respect to State control of the schools and of the funds which are provided by this bill; but does the Senator know of any other piece of legislation which contains prohibitions similar to those included in this bill?

Mr. BYRD. I think there have been quite a number of bills which have provided, in their original text, that the sole control of the funds should rest with the States and localities; but in each and every case, sooner or later the Federal Government has exercised control over its own funds. No one can blame the Federal Government for doing so. Those funds represent money which comes out of the Federal Treasury. It is questionable whether we ought to turn over to the treasuries of the States such large sums without any strings whatever attached to them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the directions which are tied to this particular bill are that the funds shall be expended for the purposes of the proposed legislation.

Mr. BYRD. I understand that. That would be the case today, if the bill should be passed; but that is not binding on the Congress which will convene next January.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But that can be said about any piece of legislation.

Mr. BYRD. Yes, it can be. It is impossible to give any guaranty to the States that the expenditure of these funds will not be controlled by the Federal Government. When such a guaranty is given, it is not worth the paper it is written on. No such guaranty can be given. The Senator knows that to be so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know it. But we are dealing with this proposed legislation, and certainly it contains a provision in understandable English that it shall not be used except for the purposes provided.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator knows that such a provision would not be even morally binding on the Congress which convenes next January, which would not have enacted this legislation.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Who is to determine whether the money granted to the States under this bill for education is being used for the purposes for which it was granted?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are passing it over to the States. It seems to be the contention of the Senator that the Federal Government, aside from contributing Federal funds, shall have nothing to say as to how the money shall be spent in the State, so long as the money is used for the purposes of education.

Mr. BALDWIN. Suppose a State were to put the money into its highway fund. Could the Federal Government stop that, under this bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think so.

Mr. BALDWIN. It seems to me absolutely necessary that it must be able to stop it. Right there we have Federal control, do we not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We have Federal control, because we are here proposing to enact legislation to help public-school education. That means that the money cannot be used for public highways or anything else except the purposes for which it was authorized.

Mr. BALDWIN. Suppose a State using these Federal funds had the most impossible, inefficient, ineffective, profligate system of education. Is the Federal Government going to tax the other States that have good systems of education, in order to maintain that kind of an educational system in one of the States whose income is low?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that if we are appropriating public funds for a specific purpose, it will be up to the Federal Government to see to it that the money is used for that specific purpose.

Mr. BALDWIN. If my distinguished friend will concede that, then he concedes the argument that the distinguished Senator from Virginia makes, namely, that the Federal Government of necessity must have control. And once the camel gets his head under the tent, there will be Federal control of education.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; there will not be Federal control of education, because the business of the Federal Government will end when it sees that the money is spent for the particular purpose for which it was authorized.

Mr. BALDWIN. My point is that the very act of the Federal Government in seeing that the money is spent for the particular purpose for which it was appropriated is in itself Federal control. That must be so, and it cannot be avoided.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I fully agree with the Senator from Connecticut, and I think it is a sound proposition. When the Congress appropriates $300,000,000 a year to help the State of Connecticut, the State of New Mexico, the State of Maryland, the State of Illinois, the State of Virginia, and the other States in respect to their educational systems, I still think it is up to the Federal Government to see to it that that money is spent for the purposes for which it was appropriated.

Mr. BALDWIN. If that is so, the provision about no Federal control, as contained in section 2, is an empty provision and means nothing.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that I raised the same question several days ago in debate with the Senator from Ohio; and in response to the inquiry then propounded, the Senator from Ohio read two or three sections of the bill which gave me to understand that the funds will be spent only in line with what the legislatures of the respective States provide insofar as education is concerned. In other words, no funds can be spent other than for educational purposes, if this bill is enacted into law, and the expenditures under it must be in line with what the State legislature provides. I asked the Senator whether, for instance, in Illinois the superintendent of public instruction, who is a powerful political figure in our State, would have the power to disburse these funds in the way he saw fit. The reply was, "No"—that the legislature would lay down the code, by appropriate and proper legislation for educational purposes, and that code would specify how the money would be spent in the State.

Mr. BALDWIN. My answer is this: Suppose the legislature did not do so.

Mr. LUCAS. If the legislature did not lay down any law as to how these moneys should be distributed, then, as I understand the situation, the State would not be eligible to receive any moneys under this bill from the Federal Treasury. I think I am correct as to that.

Mr. BALDWIN. I do not understand that that is so.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me say that the Senator from Illinois is absolutely correct. The bill contains a provision that these funds may be accepted by the Governor until the legislature meets, which might be as long as 12 months later. But the legislature must accept the funds, and they will go right into the school system, exactly as the State funds do, and will be expended exactly as the State funds are expended, without any Federal interference or attempt to control them at all.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama does not mean to say, does he, that there cannot be some interference. In appropriation bills we could specifically provide that the money should not be used in a State which practiced segregation. That could be done legally.

Mr. HILL. I say there is a question whether that could be done.

Mr. BYRD. There is no question about that in the mind of the Parliamentarian of the Senate, whom I have consulted as to this matter.

Mr. HILL. There is a question, in view of the language of the bill, and also in view of the Connally amendment which was adopted yesterday.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator from Alabama knows as well as I do that a future Congress can change the provisions of this bill at any time, and can amend an appropriation bill in such a way as to change the effect of this bill. Such things have been done frequently, time and time again in the past.

So there is no guaranty as to this matter. Let us not fool ourselves, Mr. President.

I wish to say to the southern Senators that there is no guaranty that a provision will not be adopted, sooner or later, to the effect that no part of this money will be available to States which practice segregation in the schools—a provision similar to the Langer amendment to a previous bill. The Langer amendment was adopted by the Senate. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] voted for it. I predict today that if a Senator were to offer the Langer amendment to this bill, it would be adopted.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I assure the Senator that the Langer amendment would not be adopted today.

Mr. BYRD. I do not understand how the Senator from Ohio can assure us as to that. He does not control the votes in the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to say that I have made careful inquiry.

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

Mr. BYRD. I must decline to yield just now, if the Senator from Alabama will wait I shall yield to him later.

Mr. President, I wish to make a point at this time about the so-called home-rule provision of the pending bill, a provision about which we have heard so much. Let me point out that there is no element of home rule about it. There is no way by which home rule can be guaranteed. From time to time in the debate it has been stated, and the point has been emphasized, that the bill is a home-rule bill. Yet every Senator knows that such a guaranty is not worth the paper it is written on. At any time a majority of the Senate and a majority of the House can change any of the provisions of this bill or of any other bill. There is no such thing as giving a guaranty of any value to the States that at some future time the Federal Government will not insist upon control in regard to these matters, just as it has in the case of every other Federal subsidy. I ask any Senator to point to a single Federal subsidy which has no Federal control attached to it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I know of no such control in the case of the land-grant colleges or in any educational case. The Federal Office of Education has proceeded from the beginning on the theory that it operates solely through the State educational departments; and in that field I think there has been no inference whatever with the operation of the States.

Mr. BYRD. There are rules and regulations established by the Federal Government and the Federal Office of Education with respect to every expenditure that is made.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I was going to ask the Senator whether he has examined the situation in the vocational schools, for instance. I do not say I have carefully examined as to that matter, but I have not heard of any Federal Government requirement with respect to discrimination in vocational schools.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator may not have heard of them, but there are Federal requirements.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Ohio said he knew of no Federal regulation in the field of education. I should like to ask about the regulation of teachers of economics, by which certain standards are laid down for them, and those standards must be observed and maintained before Federal money can be devoted to the payment of their salaries.

Mr. TAFT. There is no aid for economics so far as I know in any Federal law.

Mr. KEM. Oh, yes; there is—for example, home economics.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. KEM. Of course, there is.

Mr. TAFT. No.

Mr. KEM. The Senator is quite wrong, I am sorry.

Mr. BYRD. That goes to agricultural schools, and rules and regulations are laid down, and I shall be glad to submit to the Senate——

Mr. TAFT. But they have in no way attempted to regulate. I have never heard a complaint of any Federal attempt to regulate the States in regard to such matters.

Mr. BYRD. I would say to the Senator from Ohio that there are regulations. I say there is a regulation on every single dollar that comes out of Washington.

Mr. KEM. This matter is in the field of education, and there is a regulation in the field of education under the Smith-Hughes Act.

Mr. TAFT. Of course there would be regulations under this act. They would provide, for instance, "You must distribute $50 to every school." There will be regulations, of course, but they are regulations which are outlined in the law, and in which there is no discrimination of any kind or any purpose to deprive a State of any money. The State simply complies with the actuarial requirements. It receives the money regardless of anybody's discretion.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. There is no requirement in the pending bill, as I understand, as to the standard or type or kind of education that must be maintained.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. In other words, if a State wanted to take the money and

spend every nickel of it and all the rest of its appropriations for education on home economics courses, it could do it.

Mr. TAFT. It could do it. I mean the possibility is so remote that I think we may discount it. Every State has attempted, and in its constitution is usually required, to provide a free education for every child in the State who desires such an education—and sometimes, whether he desires it or not.

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

Mr. BYRD. I should like to ask that I be permitted to finish this one point, after which I shall be glad to yield for any question. I merely want to finish on this one point. I have a complete statement on it, I think.

It is obviously true that control follows the purse. Everybody knows that to be so. Federal bureaus may not control it the first year or the second year; they may not control certain other appropriations to such a point that one would hear complaint about it, but regulations are established by these bureaus, they are legal, and if not obeyed the intended recipients do not get the money.

The effort of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in offering an amendment, which was adopted yesterday, is very laudable in its purpose, but it will not prevent the future exercise of the power of control by the Federal Government. At any time, as I have stated, a majority in the House and Senate can change the provisions of this bill or of any other bill, and, under the rules of the Senate as well as the other House, appropriation bills can be amended by prescribing limitations on every appropriation granted by the Federal Government.

This appropriation will come up annually in appropriation bills, and limitations can be prescribed in an appropriation bill at any time respecting this expenditure.

Let me warn Senators who would vote for this bill on the theory that they are getting a direct gift from the Federal Government with no strings tied to it, that they are adopting a very dangerous procedure. That applies to my friends in the South.

It is well to recall what happened to Senate bill 637 when it was before the Senate on October 20, 1943. An amendment was offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] which provided that "there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act, or in State funds supplemented thereby, on account of race, creed, or color."

That not only took control of the particular expenditure but it also took control of expenditures which the State supplemented by its own funds. Adoption of that amendment was vigorously protested by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who was one of the patrons of Senate bill 637.

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

Mr. BYRD. I should prefer to finish this statement; then I shall yield.

It was, however, adopted by the Senate by a vote of 40 to 37, and it is interesting to note that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who now favors the pending bill as a home-rule bill, voted in favor of that amendment. The effect of the amendment would have been to compel the operation of mixed schools in all States that have separated schools, or such States were to be denied any benefits from the bill. That is an instance in which an appropriation of $200,000,000 would have been used to coerce the States, in certain sections, into changing their entire public-school system, although the Federal contribution was only an inconsequential part of the total.

I say now that should such an amendment be placed before the Senate today, it is my opinion that if submitted to a yea-and-nay vote it would be adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. BYRD. Let me finish my statement, please.

After the amendment to Senate bill 637 was adopted, the bill was recommitted to the committee with the aid of its own proponents. This experience should be a warning to those who are seeking to obtain a Federal grant to be used entirely as the States might desire.

Mr. President, in considering this phase of the question, which is so vital to the Southern States, it is well, too, to bear in mind that the President of the United States has endorsed a proposal whereby all Federal grants-in-aid and other forms of Federal assistance shall be denied to States which practice any form of discrimination and segregation based upon race, color, creed, or national origin. I quote from the report of the President's Committee—and the President has endorsed this in toto—as follows:

> We believe that Federal funds, supplied by taxpayers all over the Nation, must not be used to support or perpetuate the pattern of segregation in education, public housing, public-health services, or other public services and facilities generally. We recognize that these services are indispensable to individuals in modern society and to further social progress. It would be regrettable if Federal aid, conditioned on nonsegregated services, should be rejected by sections most in need of such aid * * * it believes that segregation—

This is the President's committee, endorsed by the President—

> is wrong morally and practically and must not receive financial support by the whole people.

No part of the program known as civil rights, endorsed by the President, created the resentment that this particular section did throughout the Southern States. This was because it proposed to coerce and to use a sanction against the Southern States by denying to them their share of public funds which, in part were paid to the Federal Government by these same States. The money would be withheld unless the States changed their local laws, changed their manner of living, in order to conform to the Federal pattern. I want to say that I for one am not willing to sell the constitutional rights of my State for a mess of Federal pottage. It is true of course that if this sanction is operated against the States as recommended by the President of the United States, these Federal grants could be rejected by the States. But let me remind Senators that once large Federal funds are integrated in the system of State finances—and as I said previously, those who have been Governors know this well—the withdrawal of such funds will create very difficult and serious conditions. We are told that this is a home-rule bill and that it is guaranteed in the language of the bill that it will remain a home-rule bill, yet we have before us the fact that such a bill was once amended by the Senate so as to impose restrictions of an impossible nature upon certain segments of our population, and we have before us further the fact that a Democratic President has without reservation endorsed a proposal to go to the ultimate extreme—the ultimate extreme—of denying Federal funds of all kinds to States that do not conform with Federal views as to the manner in which they operate their own affairs.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, no one has greater respect for the Senator from Virginia than I. I recall the time in 1943 when, with the aid of the Senator from Alabama and other Senators, we recommitted a bill containing an amendment which had been offered by the Senator from North Dakota. I wish to ask the Senator a question. How can the Appropriations Committee, under the Reorganization Act, and without suspending the rules of the Senate, earmark any of the money appropriated?

Mr. BYRD. The rules of the Senate provide that there can be a limitation placed on an appropriation. The Connally amendment did not amend the rules of the Senate. The Parliamentarian will certify to that. It was simply a joint action which does not relate to the Senate rules.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would it not be legislation attached to an appropriation bill?

Mr. BYRD. It can be done by restriction. The Senator knows that.

Mr. MAYBANK. But not by new legislation.

Mr. BYRD. No. But to provide that no part of the fund can be used in any State which practices segregation is not legislation but a limitation. This is done time and time again and is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Virginia knows the great respect I have for him, but I cannot see how such an amendment could be placed on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD. Under the Senate rules, limitation of an appropriation has not been regarded as legislation.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What the Senator from South Carolina is suggesting is that after this bill, with the authorization as specifically outlined in it, shall be enacted into law, a limitation can be placed on an appropriation bill with regard to

it. I submit that such a limitation would be legislation, because there is no authority under the basic law for such a limitation.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator willing to leave it to the Parliamentarian of the Senate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly. In my judgment, it would be new legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Parliamentarian to communicate to the Senate, through the Chair, whether it is possible that a limitation can be placed upon an appropriation bill, even though it be contrary to the so-called Connally amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The Chair cannot be required to rule on such a question.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I did not ask the Chair to rule upon it. I asked the Parliamentarian to give the information, through the Chair, for the benefit of the Senate, because I have great respect for the Parliamentarian. I have never known him to be incorrect on a question of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has cited a number of instances in which he says there is danger that such action as he has indicated might be taken. Of course there is danger of anything being done. If such an amendment can be attached to an appropriation made for the purpose of education it can be put on a TVA appropriation, or on a Bankhead Act appropriation, or on any other appropriation, if the Senator is correct. The Southern States have become dependent in many respects upon such appropriations. What happened when the amendment regarding segregation was adopted? The Senate rejected the bill.

Mr. BYRD. I beg the Senator's pardon. The bill was recommitted to the committee.

Mr. TAFT. But that was a defeat of the bill, and it was so recognized. There have been several amendments offered proposing to interfere with State administration, and they have been overwhelmingly rejected by the Senate. I agree that the President of the United States, in his civil-rights message, suggested that there be some such general control, but I do not think we can find a Senator who would agree that that is a proper legislative procedure.

I do not think we shall ever find a Congress which will undertake to legislate in any such indirect manner as the Senator fears may happen under this amendment on a matter so important as is this bill. We sometimes attach a small proviso here and there, but I do not think it will ever be found that the House and Senate will go along with a proviso of the kind suggested. If it can be done in connection with this bill, there are many appropriation bills, as to which it can also be done.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if we are not putting ourselves in a position of danger in this matter?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think so; not in any more danger than we are in now. That kind of legislation has been attempted over and over again. It has sometimes succeeded in connection with an unimportant measure, but I have never seen it succeed in connection with an important policy question.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator will agree that it can be done.

Mr. TAFT. That depends on a particular bill and on the rules of the House and Senate.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. If we can so legislate in connection with an education bill, we can do likewise in connection with an Army, Navy, or any other appropriation bill.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but it would have to be one from which the South would receive a particular advantage. That is the theory of the Senator, that they would be so anxious to receive the money that they would agree to that kind of a proviso. I do not think that is true. There are many other State-aid proposals as to which the position would be exactly the same.

Mr. MAYBANK. There have never been any such amendments attached to appropriations for land-grant colleges, or for highways, or anything of that kind.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am addressing myself to the fact that it has been said in the Senate that there is a permanent guaranty in the bill against any control of the use of the funds. They can be controlled not only by direct legislation, but by limitations placed upon the appropriation.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Yesterday I discussed the Connally amendment with the Senate Parliamentarian. I hope I am correctly quoting him. It is certainly the way I understood him. He told me that the Connally amendment did not change the Senate rules, that the Senate had the power in the future, as in the past, to make its own rules, and that the rules of the Senate as to limiting appropriations had been of a "thou shalt not" character; that restrictions could be put on appropriations without violating the rule against legislation attached to an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I am interested in the rules of the Senate, and I should like to know if it is in order to ask the Parliamentarian, through the present occupant of the chair, to rule on the question proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is the Senator asking whether it is in order?

Mr. WHERRY. I am interested in the rule itself.

Mr. PEPPER. Before the Chair rules, will the Chair receive an observation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the request had been withdrawn.

Mr. WHERRY. Regardless of whether the request has been withdrawn, I should like to ask the parliamentary question whether it is in order to ask the present occupant of the chair the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, it is in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I make the request.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the same question that was asked by the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, before the Chair rules on that request and responds to it, I should like to make the observation that it certainly seems to me to be a dangerous precedent and practice to start with an advisory opinion. That is what it amounts to. The question is not arising in due course, such as when a parliamentary question has to be decided by the Chair. The Senator from Virginia is imagining a determination which may arise in the future.

As the Senator from Ohio has said, law points are always decided against a background of the facts of the particular case, and whatever the Chair might say here today might represent only the opinion of the Presiding Officer at the time. The opinion of the incumbent of the chair has reference only to pending conditions, and always an appeal can be taken, and the Senate can overrule the Chair. But I think we should not take an opinion which might be given as advisory and as decisive, and perhaps be intended to influence the votes of Senators here today or tomorrow upon something which may happen in the indefinite future.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation, with the permission of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The rules of the Senate apply to what we are doing at the moment, but they do not apply to the law of the land. When the Congress of the United States passes a law, it certainly cannot be superseded by an opinion by the Parliamentarian of the Senate or of the House of Representatives. Hence I cannot see how a rule of the Senate at the particular moment would in any way interfere with what Congress does as a matter of enactment, in passing a law that is signed by the President of the United States according to the provisions of the Constitution. Therefore, the opinion of the Parliamentarian would apply only to what we are doing at the moment, whether we can do this or do that in an orderly way. But that has nothing to do with the law of the land. Only Congress can pass laws, and no Parliamentarian, construing the rules of the Senate or the House, can interfere with them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). In reply to the request for a ruling by the Chair, the Chair refers to the RECORD of January 19, 1923, where the Presiding Officer made this

statement of the rule regarding limitations:

In the face of a point of order Congress can only appropriate in an appropriation bill for purposes already authorized by law. The Congress can appropriate for all purposes authorized by law or appropriate for none of the purposes authorized by law. Within those limits Congress can limit an appropriation. Congress can say that no part of an appropriation shall be expended for a part of the purposes which the law authorizes. But a limitation must be absolutely negative. It must be in the nature simply of a veto. It cannot direct an executive officer in the discharge of his duties under existing law. Whenever it does, it ceases to be a limitation and becomes legislation in violation of the rule.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that confirms what I have stated.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] calls my attention to the fact that only last year he had placed on an appropriation bill a limitation in a dispute as to the height of the Garrison Dam, as he has reminded me. The dam was limited to a certain number of feet, and that settled the controversy between two distinguished Senators. Such action has been a well-established custom of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

While the Senator from Ohio was absent from the Chamber, I was reading certain portions of the report he submitted for himself, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Ball, and Mr. Wherry, on October 12, 1943. I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Ohio, and to say that nothing in this debate is comparable to the power and the logic of the condemnation he expressed in this report on the question of Federal subsidies for schools. I refer to just one section of the report. The title is, "Education Is Not a Federal Function." I feel certain this was written by the hand of the able Senator from Ohio. It was very ably written. I read:

Taking both parts of this bill together, it is a proposal to establish a Federal subsidy for common-school and high-school education, a function of the State governments and local governments for the last 150 years. There can be no doubt that common-school and high-school education is the obligation of the States and their local subdivisions under our constitutional system and that it is not an obligation of the Federal Government. There is nothing whatever in the Constitution which delegates to the Federal Government power to deal with questions of education. All authority for a Federal subsidy of education must be based upon the spending power, which is sufficiently broad to give a legal basis for the current bill—

Speaking of the subsidy bill in 1943—

as for other subsidies to local government. However, Federal subsidies to the States for matters which are clearly not within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government are certainly only justified on the ground that the States are unable to finance adequately the activities which are constitutionally assigned to them.

I shall take a little time later to show that the States are in much better condition today to finance these educational expenditures than is the Federal Government. The Taft report continues:

It is undoubtedly true that the taxing powers of the States are somewhat limited, and that under some conditions the Federal Government may be in a better position to raise money where it should be raised than the States themselves. It was on this ground that the Federal Government went so extensively into the financing of relief in the great emergency of 1932. Here was a tremendous new expenditure for which no provision was made in the State systems of finance, calling for a very large sum which the States were wholly unable to raise. But as the emergency declined, the Federal Government has gradually withdrawn its aid, and relief today is again administered by the States.

The same conditions do not at all apply to education. The States have always financed education. In nearly every State it has been given a prior consideration in dividing the funds which are available. One-third of all State and local taxes are spent for education. If the States and localities can't finance education, they can't finance any State or local activities.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it was the figures produced in opposition to that argument in the debate which really changed my mind, because it was perfectly clear, when we finally got down to the figures, that I was wrong in that statement. There are many States where the amount of money provided, even though the amount allocated to education was very large, over one-third of the total revenue of the State, resulted in a completely inadequate education. I think I would entirely stick by the rest of what the Senator has read, but it was the figures produced and the conditions described in the debate which changed my mind as to what necessitated Federal aid in order to give the States enough money.

Mr. BYRD. The pending bill does not do what the Senator has suggested. The bill gives money to all the States, to the rich States as well as the poorer States. It is entirely different from giving aid where there is some great emergency, where it is impossible for a State to finance its own education.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me to make an inquiry of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I gather from what the Senator from Ohio has said that he has changed his mind since he wrote the statement the Senator from Virginia has just read. I should like to ask him if he has changed his mind since he wrote the statement which accompanies Senate bill 472, which appears in the proceedings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, held in April and May last year.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know what it is.

Mr. KEM. I find on page 41 this statement:

I have already pointed out that regardless of safeguards, too much reliance on Federal money would inevitably come to mean Federal control.

I also invite the Senator's attention to the whole statement headed "Statement of Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT to accompany S. 472," which appears on page 38 of the proceedings before the subcommittee. I invite the Senator's attention to the section headed "Education primarily a community responsibility," and particularly to the sentence appearing on page 41 reading as follows:

I have already pointed out that regardless of safeguards, too much reliance on Federal money would inevitably come to mean Federal control.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have not changed my mind. That is the statement I made. We have to guard constantly, as I said when I made that statement, against Federal control.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I cannot yield at the moment.

Mr. TAFT. The balance of power is involved. I simply decided that the danger of Federal control can be guarded against. We can stand on the principle of not permitting Federal control. We have already established throughout the United States many avenues of Federal aid to States, and there is no possibility of getting away from it in many fields. If we want to defend against Federal control the thing to do is to refuse Federal control, to draft our law so there is no Federal control, as the pending bill is drafted. I would rather stand on that ground than stand on the ground suggested by the Senator that the Federal Government has no concern with education, has no concern with housing, has no concern with health; that those are matters solely for the States to take care of, and if there are poor States which are unable to give its citizens what they need, why that is too bad; those people cannot have equal opportunity. I do not think that is a defensible position. I think it is much easier and sounder to stand on the ground that we should provide Federal aid, that we are interested in the people of the States, but that we will stand against any effort to extend Federal control. That seems to me the proper position we should take respecting this bill and every other aid bill that comes before us.

Other bills have usually been so drafted that Federal control could be easily exercised. We have here drafted a bill under which Federal control cannot be exercised, and the only argument of the Senator from Virginia is that some future Congress may try to exercise Federal control. Of course, some future Congress may try to exercise Federal control. Future Congresses can do anything they want to do. They can refuse to stand on the ground on which we now propose to stand. But I think it would be a more defensible position for those opposed to Federal control if they were to advocate the granting of aid without imposing Federal control. If we do not grant aid to the States, and if the States therefore are weak, if they are unable to perform the functions they should perform, the time will come when we will have a complete Federal operation in the various fields, as we did in the whole field of relief. I think we should now have a Federal aid system for relief, for if we do not have it, and we have another unemployment crisis, I believe we will have another WPA overnight. I think we should make the States strong,

and then we will resist the impulse to impose Federal control. I think the Senate in this bill has shown its willingness, contrary to many things it would like to do, to resist the movement toward Federal control.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me so I may ask a question of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. What puzzles me about the matter is this. Suppose we grant the money to the States under the bill, and suppose the commission of education in a State is utterly wasteful, utterly useless, and profligate to the utmost degree. Must the Federal Government then proceed and continue to give money to that State without attempting to exert any control over it whatsoever?

Mr. TAFT. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. BALDWIN. Then my next question is: Under such a program as that, have we a right to vote away the money of a State that is collected from the citizens of the State?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think we have. I think we will have the right to say, for example, that we are collecting $45,000,000 while the States are only able to collect $12,000,000, and we are going to give the States a lump-sum payment out of our taxes with which they can do anything they please. That is a possible alternative to Federal aid. In that case it would simply mean that in order to run their governments they need more money than they can themselves secure. I see nothing wrong in that theory. This is a Nation of 48 States. They are independent States. If we make such a grant to the States we should let the people of the States decide how to use it; and let them raise objections to any maladministration by their own State officials. If we want to, we can send a committee of Congress to investigate, and show the people of the States if any bad conditions exist. Then we will find that the people themselves will right such conditions.

Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am going to yield to the Senators who are now on their feet; thereafter I desire to conclude what I have to say.

I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, my point was this: There is no question that the Congress has the legal right to do what the Senator suggests, but I question the wisdom of doing such a thing. Take our own particular case in the State of Connecticut. We will receive, under the terms of the bill, by virtue of the Ives amendment, $1,075,000, but we will collect from the people of the State of Connecticut $4,006,000. Do we have a right to do such a thing to the people of Connecticut and to the people of 32 other States in the Union? Do we have the right to say to them, "We are going to take your money and distribute it in other States, and we shall not do a thing respecting control of the expenditure to see whether the money shall be spent wisely, effectively, and properly"?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has recently voted for bills carrying some $6,000,000,000 for foreign nations, and it is perfectly obvious that the control over how that money shall be spent will be very remote. Yet that money comes out of the State of Connecticut, among other States. Instead of the State of Connecticut putting up $4,000,000, as the Senator just said, for education, Connecticut is probably going to put up a couple of hundred million dollars for foreign aid, and that money is much more likely to be wasted, I will say to the Senator, than the money he is now going to vote under the pending bill to the States of the Union that are not so rich as is Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. That, Mr. President, is a perfectly pertinent reply and a good one, and I will say to my distinguished friend from Ohio that that is a thing which has puzzled me for a long time. When the question comes up in the Senate as to who is to administer the foreign-aid fund, I think we will have to exercise the closest scrutiny. Then we will have our opportunity to deal with that particular problem. We have yet to deal with it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like the Senator from Connecticut to recognize the fact that the big insurance companies in his good State of Connecticut which contribute to the State's wealth, which he has told us about this afternoon, making it one of the wealthiest States of the Union, is derived in very large proportion from other States, and the Southern States are large contributors to that wealth.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield so that I may answer the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BYRD. I yield once more to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say to the Senator from Florida that the State of Connecticut, throughout her long history, has never raised any objection to the amount of money she should pay into the Federal Treasury compared to what she has gotten. The only thing she has insisted upon all the time is that that money be wisely and usefully spent, and it is the duty of the Congress to see to it that it is wisely and well spent. We do not have a right to take money from a wealthy State or from one that is not so wealthy, and throw it about in useless fashion. It seems to me that in order to prevent that in this particular situation we have got to have some form of Federal control, and that is what I am against in this particular field.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The children of America present to us the wisest possible subject for expenditure of the money proposed to be spent under the bill.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Virginia has expressed doubts and fears. Since the beginning of our Government, Congress has passed more than 150 bills granting aid of some kind, in some form, to education. In the beginning of our Government, as Senators will recall, thousands of acres of public land were given to the States for educational purposes. Senators recall the Morrill Act of 1863 under which land-grant colleges were established in the several States of the Nation. Senators will remember the Smith-Hughes Act for vocational education. Many measures have been passed granting Federal aid for education. There is hardly a single fear or doubt which has been expressed by the Senator from Virginia this afternoon with reference to the pending bill, that might not have been expressed with reference to all these many other Federal-aid-to-education measures.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator from Alabama to make a speech.

Mr. HILL. Let me finish my statement, please.

Mr. BYRD. I will yield to the Senator when I conclude my statement.

Mr. HILL. While I speak in the time of the Senator——

Mr. BYRD. That time is limited to 30 seconds.

Mr. HILL. May I recall the words of that other great Virginian, that we have no better light for the guidance of our feet than the light of experience. These fears, these doubts, proved ungrounded, without justification, with respect to all the 150 other acts passed in aid of education. They will likewise prove ungrounded and unjustified in reference to the pending bill.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico and then I shall have to ask Senators not to interrupt me again.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall not interrupt the Senator except for one purpose. I want to thank the Senator from Virginia for his kindness and his indulgence. Through the kindness of the Senator from Virginia I shall take up the side of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. There is no particular reason politically why I should agree with the Senator from Ohio, but I do love sincerity of purpose and intellectual integrity. He has stated over and over again that, like the Senator from Virginia, he wants the States to control their school systems. There is only one way to bring that about through legislation, and that is to try to put it in simple English language, and then to reason with other Senators and see what they have in mind.

The Senator from Ohio has stated that there is no reason why another Congress cannot change this law; but we are dealing with this particular piece of legislation. I ask the Senator from Virginia to read carefully section 2, and I ask him if that does not disclose completely the philosophy and the idea which he has in mind, namely, that the Senator does not want the Federal Government to interfere with our school systems, except to the extent of seeing that Federal

funds are used for the purpose of carrying out the legislation which we are now authorizing.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia for some light on a question which puzzles me very much, and that is the attitude of his colleagues from the great section of the Nation from which he comes on legislation of this kind. The Morrill Act has been referred to several times in the debate. My recollection is that the Morrill Act was originally vetoed by President Buchanan at the instance of Members of Congress from Southern States, and was placed on the statute books only after the secession of the Southern States. It became law during the period in which they were not represented in this body. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. KEM. Then I should like to ask the Senator this question, which puzzles me very much: I have heard arguments from Senators coming from the section represented by the Senator, and from other members of the great party to which he belongs—for example, the able argument of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the argument of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]—which run along this line: Education is an important function of the State; there are deficiencies in our present system; therefore the Federal Government should intervene. My question to the Senator from Virginia is this: What is the position of his colleagues on the question of keeping peace? Is keeping peace an important function? If deficiencies exist in that field, are Senators who are urging the passage of this bill willing to vote for an appropriation of Federal money for that purpose in their States?

Mr. BYRD. I cannot speak for my colleagues on a question of that kind.

Mr. President, I shall conclude as quickly as possible. I do not wish to submit to further interruptions.

I should like to read the conclusion in the very able report made by the Senator from Ohio in 1943:

> We do not subscribe to the doctrine that because our public schools and our educational facilities are a vital element in our national welfare, they thereby become the proper concern and implied responsibility of the National Government.
>
> Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. They should so remain. They have on the whole been well managed and generously supported. We have today too much centralization of control over the affairs of our citizens in a Federal bureaucracy. We should not add to it by this excursion into the field of education.

Mr. President, this report is so able and so forceful in opposition to any subsidy for education that I ask that it be printed in its entirety following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the ability of the States to operate their own school systems, because, after all, the proponents of this legislation get down to the fact that the States are not able to operate their school systems. Let me read the balances in the treasuries of the various States, exclusive of highway and veterans' funds.

In the fiscal year 1946 the great State of Alabama had $23,900,000 in its treasury. It is the largest recipient of aid of any State under this plan.

The State of California had $417,000,000, yet it would receive $5 per pupil under this plan.

Colorado had $14,000,000; Connecticut $20,000,000; Delaware $13,000,000.

I shall read the names of only the so-called submarginal States. They are the ones which would receive not only $5 per pupil, but an extra amount, calculated according to a very complicated formula.

Florida had $17,000,000 in its treasuary; Georgia $15,000,000—more than it would receive under the terms of this bill in any one year.

Idaho, which would receive aid as a submarginal State, had $7,600,000.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask the Senator if he has a break-down of the various balances, to determine whether or not many of such balances were used to retire bonds, or used in some kind of a revolving fund.

Mr. BYRD. They are balances in the general fund, exclusive of highway and veterans' funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows very well that many States have bond issues, and that certain moneys in the general fund are used to retire bonds.

Mr. BYRD. If they were for the purpose of retiring bonds they would not be in the general fund.

The great State of Iowa is listed as a submarginal State. It had $28,000,000 in its treasury; Kansas, $13,000,000; Kentucky, $17,000,000; Louisiana, $20,000,000. Maine, a submarginal State, had $5,000,000. I am reading only the names of States which are supposed to receive the extra stipend, in addition to the $5 per pupil.

Minnesota had $15,00,000; Mississippi, $15,000,000; the great State of Missouri, a submarginal State, had $40,000,000. Montana had $6,000,000; Nebraska about $4,000,000; New Hampshire $2,000,000; New Mexico $5,000,000——

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

Mr. BYRD. I am sorry, but I cannot yield to the Senator. I have yielded to him quite a number of times.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Inasmuch as the Senator has mentioned New Mexico, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. BYRD. That is very considerate of the Senator, but I cannot yield to him. I have already yielded to him a number of times.

North Carolina had $48,000,000 in its treasury. It is one of the submarginal States. Oklahoma had $10,000,000. It would receive a special stipend. South Carolina had $11,000,000; South Dakota, $12,000,000; Tennessee, $14,000,000; Texas $13,000,000; Utah, $3,000,000; and Vermont, $4,000,000.

Virginia had $53,000,000 in its treasury. Under the terms of this bill we would receive $8,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury.

West Virginia had $21,000,000 in its treasury; Wisconsin, which would receive an extra stipend, had $53,000,000 in the general treasury; Wyoming, $4,000,000.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? I have not previously asked the Senator to yield, because I did not want to interrupt him.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator must realize that every human being, every State, and every authority of Government, regardless of what it may have, if it can get something for nothing, or some easy money, will be around to get it. The Senator must realize that in regard to the great loan or gift of $6,000,000,000 we have just made to foreign countries, some of the nations to whom we have given it have billions of dollars of their own. Yet we gave the money to them. We cannot blame them for taking it if we force it on them.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that one of the greatest objections to this bill, in my judgment, is this: When local education is assumed by the Federal Government as a Federal responsibility, then the States, which have been doing so much to improve their school systems, will say, "Let the Federal Government do it." When they need extra money, they will bring pressure to bear on the Members of Congress in order to get their Federal appropriations increased, instead of making the appropriations themselves.

I wish to call attention to what the State of Virginia has done. In 1913, Virginia spent $13,102,543 on its educational system. In 1950, the State of Virginia will spend $70,490,000.

Since 1945 the State of Virginia has increased its appropriations for its educational system from $41,832,000 to $58,925,000, in 1947, and in 1950 the figure will be $70,490,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter giving a tabulation of those figures may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

> COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
> GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
> *Richmond, March 24, 1948.*
>
> Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
> *Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The following figures are furnished in reply to your telegram of today, concerning State and local funds for schools.
>
> After talking to the statistician of the State board of education, it was considered advisable to take the total expenditures from State and local funds combined for school purposes for the period up to 1947. For the years 1948, 1949, and 1950 the figures are estimates made by this office.

1920	$13,102,543
1925	22,760,706
1930	25,313,507
1935	22,777,328
1940	31,466,399
1942	32,194,915
1943	32,921,617
1944	36,867,535
1945	41,832,471
1946	46,984,665
1947	58,925,257
1948	64,225,000
1949	68,500,000
1950	70,490,000

If you wish further information which I can furnish, please call on me.

Sincerely yours,

J. H. BRADFORD,
Director of the Budget.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to call particular attention to the percentages of increase for the 5-year period 1940 to 1945, because this is very important. It strikes at the very crux of the matter, and is definite proof that the States are doing a great deal to improve their educational systems.

I shall refer first to the southern States, because they seem to be the ones that will get most of the proposed Federal appropriations. The figures I shall give now are correct, and cover the period from 1940 to 1945. I am sorry that I cannot give entirely up-to-date figures, because they would show that the percentage of increase was much greater.

For instance, the State of Alabama increased its appropriations from 1940 to 1945 by 57 percent. It has increased the amount spent on each pupil by $20 in that 5-year period.

The State of Arkansas—and I am sorry the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is not now in the Chamber—has increased its appropriations for educational purposes 92 percent in that 5-year period, and has increased the amount spent on each pupil by $28.

The State of Florida has increased its appropriations by 62 percent in that 5-year period; the State of Georgia by almost 54 percent; the State of Kentucky by 73 percent—all in a period of 5 years ending in 1945; and since 1945 there have been still further large increases, although I do not have the figures before me.

In that 5-year period the State of Louisiana has increased its appropriations for educational purposes by 68 percent; Mississippi by 45 percent; North Carolina, 68 percent; Oklahoma, 53 percent; South Carolina, 64 percent; Texas, 55 percent; Virginia, 74 percent; and West Virginia, 46 percent.

Mr. President, I think that is a notable and laudable record on the part of those States. Many of them are regarded as poor States. The State of Arkansas, if it is a poor State, has increased its appropriations for educational purposes by 92 percent. The States are doing all in their power to improve their educational systems. I say that if we assume that education is a responsibility of the Federal Government, then when the States need additional money they will write to you and to me and to other Senators to try to get the money from the Federal Treasury, instead of trying to get it from local taxes, where it should come from.

Let me say just a word about the extravagance and efficiency of these aids to the States. Mr. President, what is a grant to a State? How can the Federal Government grant anything to a State? The Federal Government does not own any property. It has no property of its own. It only has the revenue which it collects from the citizens of the 48 States. We cannot get a gift from the Federal Government, because we are the Federal Government. When the money comes to Washington, where there are 1,154 bureaus, the bureaus take their toll from it, their 15 percent, before they pay any money back to us. I ask any Senator to name any property that the Federal Government has, that produces any revenue. The Federal Government has only the revenue which comes from the 48 States of the Union.

My distinguished friend, the Senator from Ohio, and other leading Republicans talk about the great bureaucracy that has been built in Washington, the greatest bureaucracy the world has ever known. Nothing has ever equaled it. There are 1,154 separate and distinct bureaus in Washington. There are 2,000,000 Government employees in those bureaus, and they are trying to find ways and means to manage the affairs of the States. Every single dollar that we give to be handled through the Federal Government adds to the bureaucracy in Washington. I think in the next campaign that will be a great issue. I think the Republicans will say there is in the Federal Government the greatest bureaucracy ever known, with 2,000,000 employees, who are being paid in excess of $6,000,000,000 in salaries, and now it is proposed to add to that bureaucracy in order to do something the States are doing and can do themselves.

If the States were doing nothing for education, and had not made the great increases in their appropriations for education which I have cited, the situation would be different. Let me point out that if we had the figures for the increases in appropriations for education that the States themselves have made between 1945 and 1948, those figures would be much greater than the ones I have stated today. There is not one southern State that has not increased its appropriations and expenditures for schools by approximately 50 percent in a period of 5 years. That is not a bad record. In the South we are making progress with this problem.

So I am unable to see how anyone can justify voting to federalize our public-school system—and I think it means that in the end—or voting to give the Federal Government influence, at least, in the control of our public-school system, when we are doing so much for ourselves.

Let me say a word in regard to the grants that now are being made to the States by the Federal Government. The Federal Government is granting to the States at this time $2,363,000,000 annually in 8 different categories. I shall not take time to read all of them; but we already are giving the States more than $2,000,000,000 a year in various types of aid. Let me say once more—I said it in the first part of my address—that we are going to be faced, Mr. President, within the next 2 years with the most critical financial situation the United States has ever been confronted with. I make the confident prediction that within a 2-year period we shall have a Federal budget of $50,000,000,000. I ask any Senator on this floor to tell me where Federal taxes will come from with which to pay a Federal budget of $50,000,000,000. Then why should we undertake a new costly expenditure now?

We must rearm. All of us are in favor of that; I am strongly in favor of it. Instead of spending $1,000,000,000, as we did on armaments before World War II, we shall have to spend $20,000,000,000 or perhaps $25,000,000,000 on rearmament. We are rearming just as if we were going to war again. I pray to God that we are not.

Then we have the interest on the public debt, which is $5,000,000,000—far more than we had before the war.

We are permanently embarked upon a foreign-aid program. I say that advisedly. I say the foreign-aid program will continue as long as Russia is a menace, and Russia will be a menace either until she disarms or until she changes her form of government. I challenge any Senator to deny that. If Russia has the same form of government 5 years from now and if Russia has the same military preparedness 5 years from now, we shall have to increase the amount of foreign aid, rather than reduce it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BYRD. I yield, although I would prefer to continue.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to emphasize what the Senator from Virginia has said; namely, that foreign aid will continue so long as Russia is a menace, or until we are broke and have nothing to give the other nations.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; that statement can well be added.

Mr. President, we shall have fixed charges of approximately $20,000,000,000 a year for the military. We shall not be able to reduce that if we once start in on it.

We shall have $8,000,000,000 a year for foreign aid, $5,000,000,000 a year interest on the public debt, and $7,000,000,000 a year for the veterans. Those four classes or categories are fixed charges. I care not how much one may desire to have economy; there will be no reductions in those expenditures, in my judgment, for many, many years to come.

Then we have our ordinary expenses of Government, which now are $12,000,000,000 a year. They may be reduced somewhat; they must be reduced some. But the best prospect we have today is a budget of $50,000,000,000, which will mean a controlled economy in this country. It will mean the conditions similar to those that now exist in England, whereby a farmer cannot kill a pig for his

own use unless he gets a permit from his own government, whereby labor is conscripted and taken from one plant to another, because we cannot spend $50,000,000,000 and maintain our private enterprise system, except under the most dramatic governmental controls.

The money has got to come through taxation. It cannot come through deficit financing. We have a debt of $255,000,000,000. I say if this country goes on a permanent deficit basis, it will shake the foundation of the credit of America so that our bonds will go down to such a point and such a condition will be created that every bank and every insurance company will be destroyed. If Government bonds should go down 5 to 10 points, there would be hardly a solvent bank in America, there would not be a solvent insurance company in America. And if we have continued deficits, unless we exact from the people the necessary money with which to pay the $50,000,000,000, then we shall destroy the confidence of the people in the financial stability of the United States. Let me say, as one who is a member of the Senate Finance Committee—I claim no credit for being an expert; I am not one; but let me say that when an attempt is made to collect from the people of this country under their private enterprise system $50,000,000,000, that is something that will strain the credit of America right down to the lowest depths. There has not been a situation so perilous as the one which confronts us now with respect to the financial security of America.

Mr. President, it is for that reason and for other reasons that I am so unalterably opposed to the pending legislation, opening up a vast new field of expenditures, by giving to the States a mere item of the cost of their educational systems.

The Senator from Ohio says he is convinced that the States cannot maintain their educational systems. If that be true, the $300,000,000 will be merely a drop in the bucket, nothing more. It will have to be increased and increased, and that on top of other enormous expenditures which must be made. I say the time has come to restrain it, instead of looking for new avenues to spend, let us try to restrict our expenditures and prepare ourselves for the storm that is coming in the future.

Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks two tables in connection with this subject.

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

(See exhibits B and C.)

EXHIBIT A

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES IN MORE ADEQUATE FINANCING PUBLIC EDUCATION

Mr. Taft (for himself, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Ball, and Mr. Wherry), from the Committee on Education and Labor, submitted the following minority views to accompany S. 637:

"We cannot give our support to the bill (S. 637) 'to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, which has been reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, and we are submitting this statement of our views as to this legislation and of the reasons why, in our judgment, it is both unwise and inexpedient for it to pass.

"ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

"The current bill differs in some important respects from the bills which have been presented in previous sessions of the Senate, but which have never been given consideration by the Senate. It contains two parts, based on fundamentally different grounds.

"First, it proposes an annual appropriation of $200,000,000 to be divided among all of the States in proportion to the average daily attendance of pupils in the elementary and secondary schools in each State. This money is to be used only for the payment of teachers' salaries. It is provided that the sums so used must be additional to any sum spent by the State for such purposes in 1942, and that the State must continue to pay out of its own funds the average annual salaries which it paid on February 1, 1943. This appropriation has no relation to equalization of educational opportunities, nor to the special conditions which may exist in any of the poorer States. While apparently only a relief measure, and stated to be for emergency purposes, there is no time limit on the authorization.

"The other portion of the bill appropriates $100,000,000 to be used for equalizing the amounts spent for education in the various States. This means, of course, a distribution to those States which have the lowest per capita income according to a certain formula established in the bill. It results in $58,000,000 of the $100,000,000 being paid to 13 States. The justification for this appropriation is based on the fact that, taking the country as a whole, existing educational opportunities and facilities are variable and unequal, and deficient in many particulars, due to a variety of causes, one of which without doubt is an insufficiency of funds; in other cases, indifference or neglect or poor economic conditions, or refusal by local communities to increase the tax burdens to the levy paid by other communities. No one who is open-minded and acquainted with the facts will dispute these premises. No one will deny that even though educational opportunities in the United States today are greater, and educational facilities are better, and our entire system of education more democratic, than anywhere else in the world, nevertheless there is much room for further improvement. There is some doubt, however, whether the money alone will accomplish the betterment that is needed, or whether equalization is in any way accomplished by the provisions of the bill which is offered to the Senate.

"EDUCATION IS NOT A FEDERAL FUNCTION

"Taking both parts of this bill together, it is a proposal to establish a Federal subsidy for common-school and high-school education, a function of the State governments and local governments for the last 150 years. There can be no doubt that common-school and high-school education is the obligation of the States and their local subdivisions under our constitutional system and that it is not an obligation of the Federal Government. There is nothing whatever in the Constitution which delegates to the Federal Government power to deal with questions of education. All authority for a Federal subsidy of education must be based upon the spending power, which is sufficiently broad to give a legal basis for the current bill, as for other subsidies to local government.

"However, Federal subsidies to the States for matters which are clearly not within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government are certainly only justified on the ground that the States are unable to finance adequately the activities which are constitutionally assigned to them. It is undoubtedly true that the taxing powers of the States are somewhat limited, and that under some conditions the Federal Government may be in a better position to raise money where it should be raised than the States themselves. It was on this ground that the Federal Government went so extensively into the financing of relief in the great emergency of 1932. Here was a tremendous new expenditure for which no provision was made in the State systems of finance, calling for a very large sum which the States were wholly unable to raise. But as the emergency declined, the Federal Government has gradually withdrawn its aid, and relief today is again administered by the States.

"The same conditions do not at all apply to education. The States have always financed education. In nearly every State it has been given a prior consideration in dividing the funds which are available. One-third of all State and local taxes are spent for education. If the States and localities can't finance education, they can't finance any State or local activities. In many other States, school boards are independent of cities, towns, and counties, and answerable directly to the people. In Ohio and elsewhere the people of each community are authorized to vote additional tax levies on themselves for schools if they feel that more money is needed for good educational facilities. There is complete home rule in the field of education, and that is what the people want. A curious result of this bill would be to grant additional money to many public schools in such a State as Ohio, when often the people of the community have decided that the schools don't need any more money and have refused to vote extra levies for that purpose.

"STATES ARE IN BETTER CONDITION THAN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

"There is no real evidence today that the States are unable to finance their own educational system, certainly the many large States in industrial areas which are to receive money out of the $200,000,000 relief fund. We quote from the report made by the senior Senator from Wyoming on Tuesday, October 12, to the George Postwar Planning Committee:

" 'While the national credit has been under great strain, the fiscal position of the States seems to be improving. The total debt of all of the several States of the Union as of June 30, 1943, was $2,989,000,000. Against this may be charged the growing budget surplus in the States. At the beginning of this year this amounted to $700,000,000, and it is now estimated by officials of the Census Bureau at about $1,000,000,000. The sinking funds of the States on general obligations total $430,000,000 as of June 1943, so that making allowances for the surplus and the sinking funds the debts of the States amount to a little over $1,000,000,000, as compared with the national debt of $146,000,000,000. * * * I have not had an opportunity to examine the fiscal position of cities and other local subdivisions, but it appears that all of the cities in the United States with a population of 100,000 or more at this moment have an unused debt capacity amounting to $750,000,000. These figures immediately suggest the advisability of an inquiry into the ability of the States and of the cities to carry part of the burden of public responsibility in the postwar world.'

"The Senator goes on to point out that many States are setting up postwar funds out of their surplus. The Senator's figures are fully supported by the bulletins of the Bureau of the Census issued from time to time dealing with State finances.

"It hardly seems that the States are in a position to demand relief from the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, they are not demanding relief. No State has come before us affirming its inability to deal with the educational problem. No legislature has

passed any resolutions requesting assistance. The entire proposal is placed before us by representatives of the teachers and other educational interests, who may or may not have exhausted their remedies within the States. How ridiculous it would be for these States, operating with surpluses, to ask for relief from a government which is running a deficit of $60,000,000,000 a year. As far as we can see, there is not the slightest justification for treating the present condition as an emergency which requires Federal financial assistance.

"THIS SUBSIDY WOULD BE A NONWAR ACTIVITY

"This Congress has taken the position that all expenditures for nonwar purposes should be eliminated unless they are absolutely necessary, and that our whole attention should be devoted to the prosecution of the war. On that policy we have eliminated the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Work Projects Administration, the National Youth Administration, and many other nonwar activities. It is hard to see how any slight improvement in the educational system could be accomplished in time to have any noticeable effect in the present war. Of course every activity of the Government, if it is of any value at all, has some remote relation to the morale of the people and to the prosecution of the war, but certainly the education of minor children is as far from the war as any other civilian department of the Government.

"THIS IS THE START OF A REVOLUTIONARY POLICY WHICH MAY COST $4,000,000,000

"Apart from the nonexistent emergency feature, the Federal subsidy project has been before Congress for a number of years, promoted by the National Education Association and the Federal Office of Education, but not by the States themselves. Previous bills have been based entirely on the principle of equalization, and have all been based on the argument that because some States spend much less money per pupil than others, the way to improve education is to subsidize those States.

"The whole project is based on the assumption that the more money spent on education, the better the education is. This conclusion is perhaps open to question. Startling ignorance regarding American history, which was discussed in the Senate last spring certainly could not arise from lack of financial resources. It appeared among students from all over the United States, and in many instances from students who came from those States which spend the most money on education. Undoubtedly education in some States is handicapped by lack of funds, but there are other ways in which American education can be improved besides granting Federal subsidies.

"The adoption of the present bill would undoubtedly embark the Federal Government in a gradually increasing expenditure from which it would never be relieved. If we once pay from $200 to $300 of the salary of every school teacher in the country, how can we possibly ever withdraw that support? Even if the States become richer, they will never be willing to take over this burden. Having yielded once to a very strong pressure, there will be no way in which to prevent a further yielding.

"The desires of the educators are almost without limit. The whole question of Federal aid to education is discussed in the report of the National Resources Planning Board for 1943, on page 68. That report takes the position that "the Nation is now spending less than 50 percent of the amount needed to provide a justifiable minimum educational program." Current expenditures and capital outlay for education in the United States are shown to be approximately $3,200,000,000. The "justifiable minimum annual expenditures in the postwar period" are said to be $7,385,000,000. The report then says:

"'During the years immediately following the war it does not appear probable that the total revenue available for education from State and local systems combined can be greatly increased. * * * It is therefore evident that most of the increase in expenditures for education in the postwar period must be financed almost, if not entirely, by Federal funds. * * * The only agency that can remedy the inequality among the States in the tax burden for education is the Federal Government. It should accept this role.'

"This report was written by Dr. Floyd W. Reeves, who is also Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Education, closely allied with the National Education Association and the original promoter of subsidy legislation. We see, therefore, that the real program of which this is the beginning calls for the Federal Government to finance the greater part of $4,000,000,000 a year.

"This proposal is in fact the beginning of a revolutionary change in one of our most fundamental Government activities. It should not be considered except in relation to the entire postwar activities of the Federal Government.

"WE SHOULD NOT NOW COMMIT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ANY NEW TYPE OF EXPENSE

"The Federal Government faces after the war a tremendously serious financial problem. The annual charge for interest alone will amount to $5,000,000,000. At least $5,000,000,000 will be necessary for the armed forces. At least $5,000,000,000 will be required for existing services, with some moderate increase in expenditures for social-security purposes. Many other new items of expense will be clamoring for consideration. We do not know where the point is, but there is a point at which the burden of Government will become so great that it will choke all incentive, initiative, and enterprise. At some point we can kill the goose that lays the golden egg, and force the entire country into a socialistic strait-jacket. It seems most unwise to commit ourselves now to any policy which will increase the difficulty of the postwar problem. If expenditures for education are to be undertaken, they should be undertaken when we have the whole problem before us, and can consider the relative merits of each proposal in relation to the over-all expense.

"FEDERAL SUBSIDY WOULD DESTROY LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION

"There is an even more important question. Can Federal subsidies to the public-school system be maintained without ultimately bringing about a nationalization of our educational facilities and federalized bureaucratic control? This is an eventuality which the proponents of the present bill insist is not intended and which they maintain can be avoided. They contend that by the provisions of section 1 the danger is removed. We seriously question this conclusion. We believe that in the complexity of reports, of plans, of State legislation to conform to Federal policies, of counsel and advice and joint participation of the Federal Government and the States, and all of the other manifold details of the operation of the contemplated program of Federal subsidies, our public-school systems would be gradually, but no less inevitably, drawn more and more under the thumb of a Federal bureaucracy.

"We have pointed out that the ultimate plans call for the Federal Government assuming perhaps half the cost of education. Our experience with the social-security laws and many others lead to the definite conclusion that Federal subsidy in the end means Federal control. Those who put up the money and have the power to refuse it dictate the policies of the local officials. Federal bureaucrats travel the country, checking up on the expenditures and the policies of every school board and other local officials. Of course, the very provisions of the act itself contradict in some respects the pious declaration of section 1 against any Federal officer controlling the administration of State schools. Under the provisions of this bill, schools would be unable to decrease their teachers' salaries or their current expenditures for schools, whether those expenditures had been extravagant in the past or not. Under the provisions of this bill, every cent of the $200,000,000 must be spent for teachers' salaries, and not for any other necessary school purposes. Under the provisions of this bill a new system of reports must be set up from all local schools to a State educational authority. These provisions may not require substantial changes in school administration, but they illustrate the principle that it is impossible to give Federal money without controlling to some extent the expenditure of that money and the administration of the schools which spend it. If the amount is increased it is inevitable that Congress and the Federal authorities will insist upon the natural right to state the conditions of administration on which Federal funds are provided.

"Of course, the same thing is true of all Federal-aid programs, but the effect is much worse in the case of education. It is unnecessary to expand on the tremendous dangers of centralized control of education, because the authors of the bill agreed to those dangers when they wrote section 1. Centralized control of education gives a power to the central government far beyond that of any other control, as Hitler has illustrated in Germany. It places the whole character and knowledge of the people in the hands of a Federal bureau. That bureau is more than likely to be guided by some small group of men who believe in this method of education or that method of education. It transfers the control from the people of each district to a man or men wholly beyond the control of public opinion.

"The people don't want it. There is no matter upon which they are more insistent than local control of education. There has been difficulty in centralizing schools even on a township basis, because the people of each district want to run their own schools. We feel that the bill before us would be the beginning of the end of local self-government in education.

"THIS BILL DOES NOT EQUALIZE

"The strongest argument for the bill is that we must equalize educational opportunity throughout the United States by providing substantially the same amount of money for the education of each child. We have pointed out that money is only one of the factors in education. A $40 education in some places may be much better than a $60 education in another. But beyond that, this bill does not equalize. Some of the greatest discrepancies occur within a particular State. Some school districts may be very wealthy, where others may be very poor. State equalization does not exist in many States, and there is nothing in this bill to compel it. Within single States there may be wide differences in the money expended on children of different races.

"Thus on page 19 of the hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, we find that in Lousiana the cost per white pupil is $61.21, whereas the cost per Negro pupil is $12.62. Nothing in this act requires any equalization between white and Negro pupils. It is true that the bill requires the Federal funds to be distributed on an equitable basis between white schools and Negro schools, but it does not change the distribution of Louisiana funds. The result, as shown in the hearings under this bill, would be that white students would be educated at an expense of $76.40 apiece as compared to $23.61 per Negro student. The difference would be $52.79 after the passage of the bill as compared to $48.59 today.

"The bill, therefore, does not do the very thing which it is supposed to do. Equalization, as a matter of fact, cannot be secured except by complete Federal control and direction. Everyone agrees that complete Federal control and direction are worse than the inequality which now exists. It may be fairly argued that if the States and local communities are to be left alone to run their schools as they see fit, and to spend Federal moneys for school subsidies as they see fit, such an arrangement is indefensible from the standpoint of the Federal Government and the taxpayers generally. Congress ought not to give away Federal funds to the States, with no Federal control over the spending of the funds. If on the other hand the Federal Government is to retain control over the expenditures and to dictate them, then it means Federal control of education—an alternative equally obnoxious. There is no middle ground.

"Since the bill proposed does not in fact equalize, it is nothing except a subsidy for the increase of teachers' salaries. Such a subsidy is wholly unjustified when the States are better off financially than the Federal Government. We may admit that many teachers are underpaid, but there may be many who are not underpaid. This bill proposes to increase the salary of every teacher. Certainly Congress is not in a position to judge of the correctness of such a policy.

"CONCLUSION

"We do not subscribe to the doctrine that because our public schools and our educational facilities are a vital element in our national welfare, they thereby become the proper concern and implied responsibility of the National Government.

"Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. They should so remain. They have on the whole been well managed and generously supported. We have today too much centralization of control over the affairs of our citizens in a Federal bureaucracy. We should not add to it by this new excursion into the field of education."

EXHIBIT B

	State balances, end fiscal year 1946, exclusive of highways and veterans (millions)	Funds available to States under pending bill (millions)	Percent of total Federal revenue paid by States for calendar year 1947	Percent of total payments each State will receive under pending bill by States
Alabama	$23.9	$19.4	½	3⅓
Arizona	4.9	1.7	⅕	⅔
Arkansas	2.2	12.4	¼	4
California	417.5	7.2	7½	2⅓
Colorado	14.9	1.2	½	⅓
Connecticut	20.1	1.7	1½	⅔
Delaware	13.7	0.3	¾	1/11
Florida	17.2	2.2	1	⅔
Georgia	15.3	17.7	1	6
Idaho	7.6	1.0	⅕	⅓
Illinois	167.9	7.5	8¾	2⅓
Indiana	68.7	3.6	2¼	1
Iowa	28.4	2.5	1	⅔
Kansas	13.3	1.8	¾	⅔
Kentucky	17.9	16.1	1¾	5⅓
Louisiana	20.3	11.0	¾	¾
Maine	5.0	1.0	¼	⅓
Maryland	17.2	2.1	2	⅔
Massachusetts	11.3	4.1	3¼	1⅓
Michigan	21.5	6.0	4¾	3
Minnesota	15.5	2.8	1½	1
Mississippi	15.2	17.0	¼	5⅔
Missouri	40.4	3.7	2¼	1⅓
Montana	5.8	.5	⅙	⅙
Nebraska	3.8	1.3	¾	⅓
Nevada	2.5	.1	1/10	1/23
New Hampshire	2.0	.6	⅕	⅓
New Jersey	42.0	4.0	3.0	1⅓
New Mexico	5.5	3.4	⅛	1.0
New York	501.4	12.0	19.0	3.0
North Carolina	48.0	22.8	3.0	7⅔
North Dakota	14.5	1.6	⅛	½

EXHIBIT B—Continued

	State balances, end fiscal year 1946, exclusive of highways and veterans (millions)	Funds available to States under pending bill (millions)	Percent of total Federal revenue paid by States for calendar year 1947	Percent of total payments each State will receive under pending bill by States
Ohio	$145.1	$7.1	6.0	2⅓
Oklahoma	10.7	9.2	¾	3.0
Oregon	43.8	1.1	¾	⅓
Pennsylvania	109.0	10.4	7¼	3⅓
Rhode Island	6.2	.7	½	¼
South Carolina	10.9	13.8	½	4⅔
South Dakota	11.6	1.4	¼	½
Tennessee	14.1	14.7	¾	5.0
Texas	13.4	18.6	2¾	6.0
Utah	3.1	1.5	¼	½
Vermont	3.9	.6	1/10	⅕
Virginia	53.2	8.0	1¾	2⅔
Washington	77.3	1.8	1¼	¾
West Virginia	21.6	10.4	½	3⅓
Wisconsin	53.1	3.3	1¾	1.0
Wyoming	3.9	.3	1/12	1/11
Total	2,186.3			

EXHIBIT C

Expenditure increase for public-school education in 5-year period 1940–45 shown in percentage and on per pupil basis; average increase is about 42 percent, which is about 10 percent above increase for Federal employees

	Percent of increase in 5-year period, 1940–45	Money increase per pupil in 5-year period, 1940–45	Average daily attendance, 1945
United States average	42.37	$37.32	19,671,398
Alabama [1]	57.44	20.77	529,165
Arizona	32.51	31.29	91,444
Arkansas [1]	92.22	28.91	315,742
California	15.11	21.45	1,125,733
Colorado	40.67	37.43	170,276
Connecticut	46.09	50.32	223,971
Delaware	22.60	24.53	36,234
District of Columbia	22.23	29.28	77,762
Florida [1]	62.04	36.20	322,748
Georgia [1]	53.98	22.76	546,480
Idaho	43.93	34.29	93,040
Illinois	46.99	54.13	954,458
Indiana	52.43	45.16	534,535
Iowa	44.36	38.36	386,021
Kansas	58.39	48.24	271,784
Kentucky [1]	73.02	34.16	415,478
Louisiana [1]	68.45	38.73	366,965
Maine	53.94	34.25	131,521
Maryland	36.00	30.17	250,109
Massachusetts	45.54	52.15	514,334
Michigan	38.27	35.35	859,517
Minnesota	43.74	43.91	395,227
Mississippi [1]	45.83	14.08	448,684
Missouri	40.70	32.71	498,684
Montana	49.83	54.35	78,690
Nebraska	71.05	52.87	200,753
Nevada	18.68	24.53	19,192
New Hampshire	43.99	40.17	57,601
New Jersey	45.38	61.91	532,669
New Mexico	57.12	43.62	94,397
New York	23.98	37.61	1,556,225
North Carolina [1]	68.65	28.05	713,146
North Dakota	92.46	63.68	100,790
Ohio	43.46	41.88	1,096,961
Oklahoma [1]	53.28	33.58	381,028
Oregon	48.39	47.14	176,453
Pennsylvania	48.19	44.55	1,352,646
Rhode Island	41.64	43.79	80,312
South Carolina [1]	64.24	25.49	362,056
South Dakota	69.15	59.12	97,565
Tennessee [1]	57.37	25.41	509,678
Texas [1]	55.55	36.59	1,013,514
Utah	53.23	41.77	122,432
Vermont	38.58	32.82	49,436
Virginia [1]	74.26	35.58	467,297
Washington	51.72	54.47	292,917
West Virginia [1]	46.26	29.47	363,275
Wisconsin	54.18	49.34	431,229
Wyoming	51.91	56.33	41,220

[1] Southern State.

Source: U. S. Office of Education, and Library of Congress.

EXHIBIT D

Federal expenditures in direct payments to States under cooperative arrangements, and within States for relief and other aid (fiscal years 1947, 1946, and 1934–45, inclusive)

State	1947 estimated (millions)	1946 (millions)	Combined payments, 1934–45, inclusive (millions)	Total, 1934–47 (millions)
Alabama	$30.1	$21.8	$649.3	$701.2
Arizona	16.4	9.8	216.5	242.7
Arkansas	25.3	15.8	560.4	601.5
California	121.9	93.4	1,851.8	1,067.1
Colorado	30.7	25.1	495.0	550.8
Connecticut	12.9	9.8	317.3	340.0
Delaware	3.6	2.4	54.4	60.4
District of Columbia	9.9	7.7	351.6	369.1
Florida	30.0	21.6	443.6	495.2
Georgia	41.5	27.0	655.3	723.8
Idaho	16.8	11.6	264.0	292.4
Illinois	76.2	62.2	1,976.7	1,215.1
Indiana	37.4	27.4	865.9	930.7
Iowa	37.1	31.2	756.6	824.9
Kansas	33.1	20.8	662.6	716.5
Kentucky	34.4	27.7	530.3	592.4
Louisiana	33.2	32.7	559.9	615.8
Maine	10.5	7.4	173.0	190.9
Maryland	15.3	11.9	359.8	387.6
Massachusetts	40.4	29.4	1,024.2	1,083.8
Michigan	60.9	47.0	1,164.0	1,171.9
Minnesota	41.4	36.6	868.2	946.2
Mississippi	27.5	17.8	563.3	608.6
Missouri	57.2	41.2	972.9	971.3
Montana	17.9	15.9	354.8	388.6
Nebraska	28.7	21.0	567.0	616.7
Nevada	6.0	3.1	89.8	98.9
New Hampshire	5.0	3.6	109.8	118.4
New Jersey	22.6	16.8	787.4	826.8
New Mexico	14.0	10.1	228.3	252.4
New York	86.0	68.1	2,788.5	2,940.6
North Carolina	35.5	22.5	608.7	666.7
North Dakota	14.7	20.3	400.1	435.1
Ohio	63.8	48.8	1,736.5	1,849.1
Oklahoma	58.3	41.0	740.3	839.6
Oregon	25.8	18.7	413.9	458.4
Pennsylvania	67.8	48.0	2,127.4	2,243.2
Rhode Island	5.0	4.1	140.4	149.5
South Carolina	21.8	14.6	478.1	514.5
South Dakota	15.2	11.7	392.5	419.4
Tennessee	33.6	27.8	527.4	588.8
Texas	110.5	76.8	1,672.6	1,859.9
Utah	15.7	10.7	241.2	267.6
Vermont	5.3	3.9	86.1	95.3
Virginia	22.6	20.0	522.0	564.6
Washington	41.3	36.0	674.0	751.3
West Virginia	16.5	12.4	401.3	430.2
Wisconsin	35.6	27.7	804.7	868.0
Wyoming	11.5	8.6	151.5	171.6
Possessions	32.4	61.3	424.5	518.2
Total	1,694.0	1,290.1	33,807.5	36,791.6

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. Due to train reservations which have been made somewhat in advance, I find it will be impossible for me to remain to vote on the pending measure. I should like to state for the RECORD, however, that, if I were present and permitted to vote, I would vote yea upon the final passage of the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the Senator from Rhode Island that it was the purpose to consider the daylight-saving bill at the conclusion of consideration of Federal aid to education. I understood I was to notify the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McGRATH. I understand that is the program, and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has consented to sponsor the legislation on the floor. Also, the Senator from Louisiana has promised to be here tomorrow to conclude that item of business.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, at this point I should merely like to put into the RECORD the fact that on March 26 the Federal Government had a budget surplus of $7,483,588,953 for the fiscal year to this date, and that as far as I know there are no such expenditures contemplated as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] mentions. There may be some increase, but nothing to take up the surplus, unless we have war. If we have war, I think something should be done about the current situation. As I say, compared with the current operations of the Federal Government, I doubt if there is a single State with any substantial budget surplus over the current expenditures of that State, with the present grossly increased rate of expenditure of the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. TAFT. No.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether he has figures as to the Federal debt on the date he mentioned?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. The Federal debt on that date was $252,948,000,000.

Mr. KEM. I should also like to ask the Senator if he has figures on the aggregate of State debts for a comparable period?

Mr. TAFT. No. I suggest that the debts of States and localities would probably aggregate five or six billion dollars.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the beginning of Government control of any section of American life, sectors of activity, or of communities, is always related to a good objective. Price controls, rationing, the Wagner Act, the Taft-Hartley Act, housing bills, large appropriations for foreign countries under the guise of loans, the Reciprocal Trade Act, treaties such as the Italian slave-labor treaty, the World Bank, the world trade organization, the stabilization fund, and local subsidies all look good when the advocates say that it is an emergency and that the current cure for the current problem is necessary and stands alone between this Nation and chaos. The small matter that practically none of these so-called emergency measures seem to work out as predicted apparently has little effect on future actions.

Mr. President, I am in accord with the thought that the Federal Government must offer cooperation and assistance in the field of education, but I do not believe the manner in which such cooperation is to be extended through the pending legislation has been thoroughly explored, and I doubt the advisability of adopting the presently proposed legislation as now written.

Mr. President, I want to read into the RECORD a couple of paragraphs from a letter I have received from Mr. Earl Wooster, superintendent of schools in my State at Reno, in which, among other things, he says:

> I would like your consideration of the matter of 50–50 matching funds for institutions in which the source of money is raised through taxation. There is before Congress at the present time a bill for Federal aid for education. This bill, I think, would mean the setting up of Federal agencies on a long-term basis which might wish to determine school policies and thereby interfere with local action. I feel that during this time of expansion just as much service can be done to the schools by aiding in the construction of school buildings. With such a program there would not be any Federal interference since Federal participation would cease as soon as the building was completed.
>
> Certainly with the impetus being given to national defense we cannot help but feel that an intelligent citizenry offering opportunity for boys and girls to do more of their studies in science and in other important fields would give us opportunity to strengthen ourselves in those areas in which we are very apt to need the greatest possible strength in the future. I believe an ideal requirement of any program of using Federal funds for the building of educational institutions would be a requirement that they offer better than average facilities for work in science and mathematics. I believe it might also be required that there be a school area sufficient so that ROTC or other designated activities might be held there.

Mr. President, this communication from the superintendent of schools in my own State of Nevada, city of Reno, shows the trend of thinking in this connection, and it is my current opinion from the evidence at hand that further consideration should be given to this important question, prior to the passage of any legislation that could well establish an unwise precedent.

We know from experience that the $300,000,000 presently included in the pending measure is only a beginning—the amount will be raised each year under pressure of emergency need, soon the amount would be one-half billion dollars, then three-fourths of a billion dollars, then $1,000,000,000, and finally, when the States' economy had been adjusted to such annual asistance, any administration which might in the future become interested in directing the expenditure of the Federal funds would find a weakened resistance since the States could then well be in such a position of dependency upon such funds that they would be forced to accept more restrictive conditions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing all the States, the amount to be expended in each State, the amount to be received by each State, the percentage expended of income payments for education, and the average amount expended of income payments for education per pupil in average daily attendance.

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

S. 472, Federal aid to education bill

State	Amount to be expended by each State	Amount to be received by each State [1]	Percent expended of income payments for education [2]	Average amount expended of income payments for education per pupil in average daily attendance (nearest dollar)
Alabama	$1,770,000	$19,390,000+	1.79	$55
Arizona	570,000	1,750,000+	2.31	124
Arkansas	750,000	12,390,000+	1.92	58
California	24,960,000	7,260,000−	1.61	156
Colorado	1,800,000	1,225,000−	2.12	129
Connecticut	5,190,000	1,705,000−	1.46	157
Delaware	2,970,000	285,000−	1.34	130
District of Columbia	3,780,000	720,000−	1.13	158
Florida	2,910,000	2,260,000−	1.61	93
Georgia	3,000,000	17,745,000+	1.80	64
Idaho	450,000	1,010,000+	2.36	111
Illinois	26,250,000	7,520,000−	1.78	167
Indiana	6,780,000	3,645,000−	2.03	130
Iowa	2,370,000	2,505,000+	2.24	124
Kansas	2,880,000	1,860,000−	2.18	130
Kentucky	5,250,000	16,120,000+	2.13	80
Louisiana	2,550,000	11,075,000+	2.11	95
Maine	990,000	1,060,000+	1.72	97
Maryland	5,340,000	2,135,000−	1.22	113
Massachusetts	10,740,000	4,160,000−	1.74	166
Michigan	14,580,000	5,980,000−	1.78	126
Minnesota	4,440,000	2,820,000−	2.54	143
Mississippi	690,000	16,985,000+	1.99	43
Missouri	8,070,000	3,755,000−	1.74	112
Montana	450,000	545,000+	2.63	162
Nebraska	2,070,000	1,350,000−	2.32	126
Nevada	270,000	135,000−	1.55	145
New Hampshire	570,000	640,000+	1.98	130
New Jersey	9,420,000	4,025,000−	2.04	197
New Mexico	330,000	3,390,000+	3.25	119
New York	60,120,000	12,010,000−	1.79	194
North Carolina	8,100,000	22,825,000+	2.21	66
North Dakota	330,000	1,655,000−	2.73	132
Ohio	19,170,000	7,090,000−	1.76	135
Oklahoma	2,160,000	9,195,000+	2.42	95
Oregon	2,040,000	1,125,000−	1.89	144
Pennsylvania	23,730,000	10,410,000−	1.91	136
Rhode Island	1,680,000	720,000−	1.39	148
South Carolina	1,350,000	13,855,000+	2.20	64
South Dakota	330,000	1,445,000+	2.96	143
Tennessee	2,400,000	14,785,000+	1.90	69
Texas	7,950,000	18,675,000+	1.97	102
Utah	600,000	1,535,000+	2.58	117
Vermont	330,000	615,000+	2.08	117
Virginia	5,580,000	8,070,000+	1.62	82
Washington	4,020,000	1,820,000−	1.78	153
West Virginia	1,440,000	10,405,000+	2.79	92
Wisconsin	6,240,000	3,300,000−	2.10	139
Wyoming	240,000	280,000+	2.67	152
Total	300,000,000	[3] 295,260,000	------	------

[1] From Committee on Labor and Public Welfare Report No. 425, pp. 15–16.
[2] Ibid., pp. 14–15.
[3] Territories and possessions not included in total.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I note that my own State of Nevada will contribute much more to the fund than it will receive. However, I would not vote adversely on this proposed legislation for that reason; but I do not believe, with all due regard to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that sufficient consideration has been given to the basis and the method of such Federal cooperation.

I want to take this occasion to quote a recent Supreme Court decision on a Federal issue, which declares that "it is consistent with due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators have asked concerning the length of time the Senate will remain in session this afternoon. As I announced several days ago and on several occasions since that time, it is our intention to complete action on the bill tonight. I think we shall possibly be able to vote at approximately 6:30 or 7 o'clock this evening. If it meets with the approval of the Senate, as I hope it does, that is the intended procedure. I think Senators should be available at that time and regulate their affairs accordingly.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the majority whip that the Senate will endeavor to complete action on the bill today, I wish to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Florida for yielding me a few moments. I shall try to complete my statement as rapidly as I can in order that the bill, which is so important to the children and to the people of the United States, may be concluded tonight.

Mr. President, had I not already known the need from long years of close association with this problem of public education in South Carolina, there would be no doubt in my mind now. I commend the authors of this bill on the clear and straightforward thinking evidenced in the provisions for aid.

Of course, there is no doubt in the minds of my distinguished colleagues in this Chamber as to my unwavering stand on any matter even touching on the sovereignty of State rights. Let me say that in addition to reflecting my own most sincere convictions, I am unstintingly carrying out the written and voiced endorsements of the people of South Carolina.

I could not ask for clearer or more forceful wording than that to be found in sections 2 and 6 in particular. It is especially gratifying to note that the wording of section 2 is the same as that of an amendment offered to Senate bill 637 in 1943 by the senior Senator from Arkansas and myself. It is a real pleasure for once to be able to sustain so completely the exact provisions of a bill which bears so directly on the day-to-day life of our young people at their most impressionable age as well as those who would guide them through this period. The bill, as it now stands, shows complete and remarkable attention to the right of the several States to act within their constitutional authority. I am glad to be able to dismiss the provisions of this legislation with a simple and wholehearted endorsement of its aims. I sincerely hope that it may be neither defeated nor hampered with crippling amendments.

I may say that in 1943, at some length, day after day, I had the privilege of supporting Senate bill 637 and the amendments which were placed on it.

But, Mr. President, in view of some of the able opposition to this bill, and out of respect for the repeated requests of the people of South Carolina for such legislation, I must take this opportunity not merely to vote for it but further to cite examples of the need for such aid to the school systems of the several States. Although the States needing this aid the most are in the minority in number, I cannot help but agree with the authors that the need is universal and should be so extended.

According to the report made to accompany the bill, there are only 23 States which would receive more than the $5 minimum allotment per child. There are 17 States which would receive more than $10, and only 9 which would receive $20 or more.

Mr. President, if each of my colleagues could see, as I have, the pitiful lack of educational opportunities for so many of our people I know they could never find it in their hearts to deny this aid under the terms of such a well-intended law.

Those of us who have had to stand by and watch the growing migration of our most able young people to wealthier centers in order that they might attain the benefits of a better educational system, and who have seen an appalling number of educations interrupted at the fourth or fifth year because further attendance was not practical, know that approximately 1,200,000 of our young men were rejected during the past war because of educational deficiencies. We know full well our great responsibility to the young people who are even now taking their places in the social and industrial society of our country.

In my State more than 16 percent did not have a fourth-grade education. Although I am in favor of selective service, one of the reasons the Army and Navy have difficulty in enlisting sufficient volunteers is because there are so many men who have been rejected because of educational deficiencies. Through no fault of their own they are being forced to take their places in an insecure world woefully unprepared and untrained for meeting the daily crises. In a State like mine where we have to support separate white and colored schools our educational appropriations are spread even thinner.

The classrooms of the Nation are being deserted in ever-increasing numbers by qualified teachers. Because the qualified teachers have been forced to leave the classrooms for better pay in other occupations, approximately one out of every seven of the remaining teachers is holding an emergency or substandard certificate. It is a strange parallel indeed to realize that we enforce rigid standards for pilots, doctors, and lawyers—we even maintain specific codes for electricians, plumbers, and brick masons—and yet we have something like 61,000 teachers with no education beyond high school. Is the molding and shaping of succeeding generations to be entrusted for years to come to the inept practices of untrained instruction? We would not think of submitting our children for a surgical operation to the unskilled hands of a premedical student. Then, I ask, why should we continue to submit these eager young minds to the distraught daily care of untrained, substandard classroom instruction?

Do not misunderstand, Mr. President. I am not placing the blame on the teachers. I have nothing but the greatest praise and admiration for those who have had the intestinal fortitude to stick by their classrooms simply through devotion to a cause which they must be sorely tempted to forsake. Surely there will be a special reward in the hereafter for those who have devoted a whole life to the daily guidance of our children with little more recompense than the satisfaction of a job well done. In these days of high living costs it is difficult enough to make both ends meet with a fairly decent living wage. At the pay we offer most of our teachers it is an utter impossibility.

While we are spending about half a billion dollars for public schools out of our national income of one hundred and sixty-five billions, we are spending three billions for beer, nearly four billions for cigarettes, and close to nine billions for liquor.

In a State where the 1945 income per capita amounted to $686, I think there is cause to feel a certain pride in the effort being made, even though the result is still a pathetic shortage of facilities and trained teachers.

We owe our young people far more than a token education, Mr. President. We owe those who would guide and counsel them during the most impressionable years of their lives more than a token payment. I think it is just that Federal aid should be granted to the educational system of our States; but only so long—I cannot make this point too strongly—only so long as it is tendered to the States without any strings attached.

Were students who are forced to drop out of primary schools now afforded the opportunity of better secondary schools, and were the secondary schools better able to provide adequate courses of instruction through at least the twelfth grade, the necessities for further schooling would not be nearly so great. Some of our better-financed secondary schools are even now extending themselves to such a point of varied and highly competent instruction that many of their graduates find they are no longer handicapped by their financial inability to go on to expensive institutions of higher learning.

Here, with this legislation, we have the opportunity to better equalize this situation. Where this opportunity is now within the reach of only a few who just happen to enjoy its fruits by virtue of having been born in or having moved to a more fortunate geographic location, under the proposed Federal assistance these increased educational facilities

would be made available to every child in this great land.

It will be difficult for this Nation to fulfill its new world role unless the population is fully informed and conscious of its obligations. Since only through an educated, intelligent electorate can we maintain a democratic government, it is necessary that we believe deeply, passionately, and earnestly in our public-school system.

Surely we can see the great need for capable leadership, not only right now but through the years to come, if we are to maintain our preeminent position in world affairs. If we are to hold our own in international affairs, then we owe it to our people that they be afforded every opportunity for preparing themselves for just and capable administration of our national and local affairs.

Mr. President, again I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for yielding to me to make these remarks.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 986

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I am directed by the Committee on Rules and Administration to report favorably two short resolutions. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the resolutions be considered. I am sure there will be no controversy over them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Rules and Administration Senate Concurrent Resolution 46, submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on March 15, 1948. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 10,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 986 submitted by the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, pursuant to Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, for the use of said joint committee.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR DECEASED SENATORS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, Senate Resolution 212, submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on March 19, 1948. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 1, line 5, to strike out "legislative" and insert "calendar."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 5, to strike out "extend their remarks" and insert "have statements printed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That on Wednesday, the 21st day of April 1948, at 3 o'clock p. m., the legislative business of the Senate be suspended for the purpose of holding memorial services for deceased Senators. Senators shall have leave for 60 calendar days to have statements printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the life, character, and public service of deceased Senators. At the conclusion of the proceedings, the President pro tempore, as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased, shall declare the Senate adjourned. The necessary expenses connected with such memorial services shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN EUROPEAN DISPLACED PERSONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am offering today for myself, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] six amendments to Senate bill 2242, known as the displaced-persons bill. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who made a special trip to Europe at the request of Secretary of War Patterson and made a report to him, is interested, and is a cosponsor of the amendments.

Amendment A provides that 200,000 eligible displaced persons may be admitted during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1949, and June 30, 1950.

Amendment B provides, in substance, that a fair cross section of all groups and elements among the displaced persons shall be included in the number to be admitted.

Amendment C is intended to mark out clearly the function of the Displaced Persons Commission authorized by S. 2242 and the function of the regular immigration authorities with respect to displaced persons, and to give sufficient authority to the Commission to carry out the purposes of the act.

Amendment D extends from December 22, 1945, to April 21, 1947, the period of time in which entrance into Germany, Austria, or Italy, makes eligible a displaced person for admittance into the United States, if other requirements are met.

Amendments E and F are technical in nature.

I would like to emphasize that the amendments which we offer have not been hastily considered. They represent the result of careful study and consideration of the displaced persons problem. The junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] were members of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary by whom the whole problem was studied for several months, and I joined in its study and consideration as a member of the full committee. The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was an advisory member of the subcommittee, representing the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] visited the displaced persons' camps last summer, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] knew the problem in 1944–45 as a member of the Army in Europe. The senior Senator from Massachusetts was one of the joint sponsors of the bill which I introduced during the last session of the Congress, and has maintained a constant interest in the problem.

The amendments which we offer represent points of honest difference which were raised in the subcommittee and full Committee on the Judiciary.

We want to give great credit to the subcommittee, which spent weeks in the consideration of the bill, and to its able chairman, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] for his fair and objective leadership. It must be remembered that the action of his subcommittee and the full committee is the only action that has been taken in the Congress toward a solution of the displaced-persons problem.

There are, however, diverse and sincere views concerning the solution of the displaced persons problem, and the responsibility of the United States in its solution. The amendments which I offer represent the views of the sponsors, and I believe the views of a great many other people of the Nation.

It is my understanding that Senate bill 2242 will soon come before the Senate for consideration, and at that time these amendments may be fully discussed. The reason for sending them to the desk today is to enable Members of the Senate to consider them and become more familiar with them at the time they are offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 472) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary

and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes.

Several Senators addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am going to insist on the regular order. Farming out of time will not be permitted except in connection with the bill before the Senate. I do not object to Senators speaking on the bill, and I have no discrimination for one side or the other in regard to the measure. We are trying to get the bill through today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's point is well taken. The Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield to the Senator from Massachusetts if I may within the rules.

Mr. WHERRY. If there was a prior arrangement whereby the Senator from Massachusetts was to speak, I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is incumbent on me, I think, to announce some of the reasons which impel me to vote against this bill.

What can fairly be said of it?

Certainly we can say that its stated purpose is good. Knowledge is power. A soundly educated citizenry is a basic national asset. I hope and believe that effective means can be devised to achieve such a goal.

But careful study convinces me that this bill will both defeat its own purpose and will bring other evils in its train. To substantiate this assertion I set down the following:

First. This measure opens the way to huge outlays of public funds and it does so at a time when we confront enormous expenditures of thousands of millions of dollars for foreign rehabilitation, which are, of course, definitely in the interest of all the American people, or else we would not make them. It does so at a time when we are about to make other enormous expenditures for Army, Navy, Air Force, and military manpower. Is this the time for another limitless outlay?

Second. The allocation of funds is in my view unfair to the State of Massachusetts which I have the honor, in part, to represent in this body. Figures indicate that the people of Massachusetts would only receive about one-third of the amount they would contribute. This is an unfair penalization of the people of a State which has no great natural resources, but must depend on the character and industry of its inhabitants.

Let us, however, disregard these fiscal factors, important as they are. What else can be said?

Third. It must also be set down that this measure has provisions which are justly repugnant to leaders of important religious groups, and that it appears to me to draw and perpetuate distinctions between citizens on the basis of race. These distinctions are invidious and un-American.

Fourth. We are not just interested in any kind of education—we want good education—and good education is not education which is imposed from a distant point free of local control and without a strong sense of local responsibility. This measure dilutes and weakens State responsibility. This is a dangerous step to take.

Fifth. Finally, Mr. President, this is a bill which does not simply give money to the States to spend as they see fit. There are strings attached to this bill—strings which are bound to lead to an increasing measure of Federal control of education. I am always slow to use the entering wedge argument. In fact, I believe this is the first time I have ever done so. I prefer to judge a thing as it stands. But as a realist I know that this scheme will grow in money and grow in power; and I sense the fact that its supporters on this floor hope and believe that it will. The shadow of the Federal inspector will be over every school in the land. This bill heads us into a centralized Federal thought pattern. To me this is violently opposed to our traditions. We are not a monolithic state. We are an edifice, built of strong stones of different shapes all bound together by the strong bond of a common patriotism.

What have we seen in Europe? We have seen the advance of dictatorship. Whenever a would-be dictator seeks to grasp power, he reaches for two offices—offices which exist in every centralized European state. One office is the Ministry of Interior who controls the courts and the police; the other office is the Ministry of Education who controls the schools and the thoughts of the young people. In this country, thank Heaven, we have never had these two offices. A would-be dictator over here would have to subvert the governments of 48 States. That would be impossible—and therein lies the strength of our system.

I cannot cast my vote for a bill which in my view strikes at this fundamental principle.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it will be a great day for my State and for my country when this legislation becomes law, and I do not, therefore, wish to trespass upon the indulgence of the Senate long, and thus delay its passage.

I have had a deep interest in the subject matter of the pending bill for many years when I first ran for the Senate in 1934, one of the planks in my platform was Federal aid for public schools. I was born as a poor boy in east Alabama. I walked 3 miles to a one-teacher common school. I sat on a rough-hewn bench in that school, and like other students in that neighborhood, suffered the limitations and the privations of the educational system of my native State of Alabama. I said, Mr. President, as I grew older, if an opportunity ever came to me to broaden the intellectual horizon of the students of the Nation, the boys and girls of America, I should avail myself of that opportunity to assist.

When I came to the Senate, I was assigned to the Committee on Education and Labor, which had jurisdiction over the subject of aid to education. For now more than 11 years I have sat upon that committee, and its successor, the present Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That committee from time to time has considered this subject and has brought forth legislation thereon.

I remember that one of the illustrious Senators from the South, Senator Pat Harrison, was one of the authors of one of the Federal aid to education bills, and I know that Pat Harrison would not have associated his name with any effort or endeavor that was not for the aid of his State, his South, and his country. Many other illustrious Members of the Senate have been identified with the authorship of legislation of this character and many others of us, though not authors have constantly aided and assisted in progressing this legislation.

Mr. President, now at long last, with a bipartisan support, and with the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is to be commended, we have this legislation before the Senate, and I am happy that the prospects are that, on this very day, we shall see its adoption and passage by the Senate.

Mr. President, I remember also in my own lifetime of hearing men argue that those who were the parents of children had the first and the exclusive responsibility of educating those children. There are still to be heard a few who will say that it is not the responsibility of those who have wealth but no children, to help provide for the education of the children of their neighbors. But, Mr. President, there are not many left who would cling to that ancient attitude toward social responsibility and obligation.

I remember the session of the legislature of my State in 1929 when we adopted policies similar to those presented here today, namely, State assistance to the poorer counties of the State, to raise the level of education in those counties to a decent minimum standard of opportunity. Mr. President, we there were confronted with the same argument which some would make here today. Why should the rich counties of the State, with their tax money, be expected to come to the assistance of the poor counties of the State for purposes of public education? But, Mr. President, in my State, and I dare say in most, if not all States of the Nation, we have long passed that milestone in educational and civic progress. Today we proudly see all the children of our State as citizens of our State, and we call upon all parts of our State to help every boy and girl in the State to be a better citizen and a better patriot.

Now, Mr. President, we have come to the next and the logical extension of that principle and that policy. We know that

the children of the country are not distributed in the same ratio as the wealth of the country exists. For example, in the South we have 30 percent of the Nation's school children, but only 17 percent of the Nation's income as shown by the data for 1941–45. That means, Mr. President, that if we are to give our children in the Southland the same educational opportunity that children can receive in the wealthier States of the Nation, we have to tax ourselves to a far greater percentage of our per capita wealth than the wealthy States have to tax their citizens in order to achieve high levels of education.

So, Mr. President, it is a logical and financial necessity that brought us to ask this assistance of our fellow countrymen and of our sister States. Now, happily, I say, Mr. President, the wisdom of this program has so appealed to the wealthy States in general, and to the membership on both sides of the aisle in the Senate, that we have a magnificent bipartisan and Nation-wide support of the legislation. Experience has taught us that we all stand or fall together; that we cannot save just one part of America and lose the rest of it. We cannot have a part of the Nation strong and another part of it weak. We must have a country that is strong from border to border if we are to have a strong America. So this is a national approach to a program of national scope and concern.

Mr. President, to confirm the facts which I have just attested, I ask to incorporate at this point in my remarks pages 172, 173, and down to the middle of page 174 in the bulletin entitled "Federal Aid to Education," issued by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

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

5. ABILITY AND EFFORT TO SUPPORT EDUCATION

Using total income payments to individuals residing in a State as a measure of the State's general financial ability, table 8, which follows, gives data on the relative effort of the States to support public education. The data show that ability to support education in 1945, as indicated in average income payments per child of school age, was 4.4 times greater in California than in Mississippi, the variations among the other States ranging below this extreme.

The great differences in the quality of educational services provided in various parts of the Nation are largely due to the combination of low financial ability and high birth rates in some regions contrasted with low birth rates and greater financial ability in other areas.

A comparison of (1) income payments per capita with (2) the percents of total income payments expended for education indicates that in general the States of lowest financial ability were making above-average effort to support education in 1945 (as shown in columns 2 and 4 of table 8). A study of the percents of population classed as urban (shown in column 7) in relation to the percents of total income payments expended for education (shown in column 4) indicates that the rural States were using larger proportions of their income for schools.

TABLE 8.—*Financial ability and effort of the States to support education*

State	1945 income payments per capita	Income payments per child from 5 to 17	Percent 1944–45 current cost of education is of total income payments	1945 total State tax revenues (thousands)	Percent 1944–45 current cost of education is of total State tax revenues	Percent of 1940 population classified as urban
	Dols.	*Dols.*		*Dols.*		
United States	1,177	5,372	1.59	5,476,459	45.0	56.5
Alabama	747	2,649	1.49	74,883	40.2	30.2
Arizona	1,026	4,368	1.96	25,846	45.1	34.8
Arkansas	659	2,384	1.56	49,362	38.5	22.2
California	1,503	9,009	1.35	566,219	32.5	71.0
Colorado	1,185	5,502	1.74	47,234	46.7	52.6
Connecticut	1,468	7,616	1.36	83,902	42.6	67.8
Delaware	1,429	7,145	1.23	13,819	34.9	52.3
District of Columbia	1,377	9,219	.99	------	------	100.0
Florida	1,049	5,463	1.26	75,890	40.2	55.1
Georgia	813	3,127	1.45	76,141	46.6	34.4
Idaho	1,112	4,773	1.99	17,240	60.6	33.7
Illinois	1,427	7,315	1.51	297,349	54.3	73.6
Indiana	1,168	5,448	1.71	133,236	52.7	55.1
Iowa	996	4,481	2.03	78,698	61.2	42.7
Kansas	1,076	5,088	1.86	58,032	61.3	41.9
Kentucky	751	2,800	1.72	65,254	51.5	29.8
Louisiana	832	3,418	1.76	119,857	29.2	41.5
Maine	1,048	4,389	1.52	30,176	42.6	40.5
Maryland	1,303	6,562	1.07	71,175	40.1	59.3
Massachusetts	1,340	6,712	1.52	164,634	52.1	89.4
Michigan	1,218	5,496	1.62	241,717	45.4	65.7
Minnesota	995	4,468	2.18	110,786	51.5	49.8
Mississippi	570	2,067	1.67	60,648	33.1	19.8
Missouri	1,063	5,055	1.49	112,977	49.9	51.8
Montana	1,228	5,236	2.32	19,981	64.4	37.8
Nebraska	1,086	4,847	1.92	27,895	91.6	39.1
Nevada	1,511	8,400	1.43	6,260	47.8	39.3
New Hampshire	977	4,600	1.65	15,138	50.0	57.6
New Jersey	1,516	7,817	1.78	174,763	60.5	81.6
New Mexico	850	2,909	2.53	24,167	46.9	33.2
New York	1,588	8,307	1.50	839,116	36.3	82.8
North Carolina	749	2,685	1.88	131,034	37.5	27.3
North Dakota	1,097	3,958	2.36	19,457	68.7	20.6
Ohio	1,329	6,382	1.53	292,567	47.6	66.8
Oklahoma	849	3,257	2.04	85,282	43.2	37.6
Oregon	1,231	6,657	1.56	53,997	47.2	48.8
Pennsylvania	1,220	5,407	1.63	332,826	55.7	66.5
Rhode Island	1,333	7,029	1.25	34,819	34.4	91.6
South Carolina	686	2,400	1.81	53,506	44.1	24.5
South Dakota	1,112	4,463	2.36	18,585	75.9	24.6
Tennessee	866	3,347	1.45	70,255	50.6	35.2
Texas	975	4,241	1.59	199,571	52.0	45.4
Utah	1,073	4,134	2.27	27,495	53.5	55.5
Vermont	1,009	4,190	1.76	12,813	45.5	34.3
Virginia	971	4,339	1.38	75,483	51.7	35.3
Washington	1,406	7,948	1.53	153,987	30.4	53.1
West Virginia	869	2,974	2.30	64,712	52.3	28.1
Wisconsin	1,159	5,202	1.77	158,852	38.1	53.5
Wyoming	1,153	5,315	2.37	8,823	77.0	37.3

Sources: (1) U. S. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Survey of Current Business, August 1947, pp. 22-23; (2) Research Division, National Education Association. Statistics of State Progress in Public Education. Research Bulletin, vol. XXV, No. 4, December 1947. Washington, D. C., the National Education Association, 1947, table 19.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall mention only one or two figures. In the State of Kentucky, for example, the 1945 income payments per capita were $751, and the income payments per child from 5 to 17 were $2,800.

Let us take the State of New York. In that State the per capita income is $1,588, twice as much as in the great State of Kentucky; and the income payments per child from 5 to 17 are $8,307, as compared to $2,800 in the great State of Kentucky—approximately four times as much. The purpose of this bill is to raise the level of education for every American boy and girl up to a minimum standard of opportunity.

The question was raised as to where the money was coming from. This is the answer: The statistics are carried in a recent outstanding article in the Washington Post, entitled "More School, More Pay." The headline is "Here's proof education raises earning power." The first paragraph reads as follows:

To those who think and say that "education doesn't pay," the Bureau of the Census has delivered a telling blow in Special Report P-46, No. 5. "Educational attainment by wage or salary income: 1940" shows a definite link between increased schooling and higher earning power.

Let us assume that the average workman in America is between 35 and 44 years of age. A workman in America, white, between 35 and 44 years of age, with no years of schooling, was found by the Census Bureau to be earning $486 a year. A man of the same age and the same race, with 7 or 8 years of elementary education, was found by the Census Bureau to have an annual income of $1,228. A man of the same age and race who had 4 years of high-school education was found by the Census Bureau to have an annual income of $1,764. A man of the same age and race who had a college education was found by the Census Bureau to have an annual income of $2,465.

Compare the white man between the ages of 35 and 44, with an income of $2,465, with the man with no education and an income of $486, and it will be seen that the man with the college education received six times as much. He may have been a man of the same inherent ability and the same strength of character. That is the answer to the argument of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who wanted to know where the money was coming from.

Mr. President, this is the best harvest we can possibly derive from the money we spend. We will have in return an abundant harvest which we could not get with any other investment, when we put our expenditure in better education and better skill and training for the boys and girls of our Nation.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not speaking from a racial standpoint; but, using the figures of the Senator from Florida, where would the Negro or the white man who receives the income which the Senator has stated, spend it? How would it affect the economy? Would the man who receives $15 a month be able to buy a second pair of overalls, as compared with the man who receives $45 a month?

Mr. PEPPER. The obvious inference from the Senator's question is absolutely correct. It is the purchasing power of the greater skill which adds to the wealth of the Nation, and helps everyone.

Mr. President, I cited the case of a white man between 35 and 44 years of age. I also have the figures of the Census Bureau for a Negro of the same age group, 35 to 44 years. The one without any education has an income for the year of $387. The man with a seventh- or eighth-grade elementary education has an income of approximately twice

as much, or $711. The man with a high-school education has an annual income of $856; and the man with a college education has an income of $1,157.

Inasmuch as I mention the Negro race, let me say that a great many of the problems of today can be solved by better educational and economic opportunities being given to the Negro people of our land.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Recurring to the economic side of the picture, the Senator knows, as does everyone else in the country, that the average business establishment, small or large, in the place where the Negro lives is operated by white persons. Where would the Negro spend his money whether he got $1,500 a year or $300 a year?

Mr. PEPPER. He would spend it primarily with white people.

I remember that in 1938 in my State, in my campaign the issue of the minimum-wage law was involved. There were some who complained about making the Negro the beneficiary of that legislation, as a citizen, as he was entitled to be.

I pointed out that every dollar added to the wages of the Negro worker would benefit the white businessman as well as the colored businessman with whom he traded, and with whom he spent the money which he earned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the entire article and the table to which I have referred.

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

MORE SCHOOL, MORE PAY—HERE'S PROOF EDUCATION RAISES EARNING POWER

To those who think and say that "education doesn't pay" the Bureau of the Census has delivered a telling blow in Special Report P-46, No. 5. "Educational Attainment by Wage or Salary Income; 1940" shows a definite link between increased schooling and higher earning power.

The recently released document bases its figures and conclusions on 1939 incomes as shown in the 1940 census, the latest total count available at this time. The Bureau arrived at its published findings by sampling a representative number of native white and Negro males, ranging from 25 to 64 years of age.

The separation into white and Negro categories is not a discriminatory procedure in the case of this survey. On the contrary, it serves as an effective indication that the Negro with equal qualifications is still far from obtaining economic equality. That this fact cannot be ascribed to lower intellectual standing has been demonstrated in a number of scientific tests.

The statistics show that of native white men with 7 to 8 years of elementary school, 70.8 percent earned less than $1,500 a year. Of those with 4 or more years of college, on the other hand, only 32 percent remained below the $1,500-income group.

The material value of education was further driven home by the fact that of those making $2,500 or more only 1.1 percent had no schooling. In the same brackets 4.8 percent had only elementary education; 11.3 percent were high school graduates; and 31.1 percent had completed at least 4 years of college.

Discussing the implications of the survey, the United States Office of Education cautions against the assumption that education alone is a factor and that schooling increases one's earning power, regardless of other circumstances. Those sincerely interested in education, are not likely to be seriously upset by that warning; they have never tried to express the value of learning in form of stock market quotations.

Far more significant is the additional remark that the economic background into which a boy is born influences his potential earning power. This works in a vicious circle, for financial criteria frequently determine whether a youngster is to attend college. All this is a highbrow way of saying that some people are still born with the traditional silver spoon in their mouths, and that the precious metal can later be converted into a good job more readily than the more lowly tin product.

Educators, however, feel justly confident that higher education, made available on a broader and more democratic basis according to ability and merit, will lessen the now severe differences in earning power.

The statistics prove that more education will be of direct benefit to the individual and to the Nation.

OFFICIAL TABULATION OF SCHOOLING AND EARNINGS

The following chart is based on a condensed table issued by the United States Office of Education. The incomes are for 1939 as shown in the 1940 census:

Age	Years of school completed			
	None	7 to 8 years elementary	4 years high school	College (4 or more)
NATIVE WHITE				
25 to 64 years	$473	$1,104	$1,454	$2,046
25 to 29 years	407	820	1,176	1,567
30 to 34 years	471	1,019	1,473	1,998
35 to 44 years	486	1,228	1,764	2,465
45 to 54 years	503	1,280	1,875	2,679
55 to 64 years	463	1,095	1,711	2,395
NEGRO				
25 to 64 years	365	656	775	1,047
25 to 29 years	316	522	689	882
30 to 34 years	348	633	770	1,000
35 to 44 years	387	711	856	1,157
45 to 54 years	373	732	902	1,201
55 to 64 years	364	682	787	1,103

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this bill does not achieve everything I would like to see it achieve. It does not assure a minimum for teachers' salaries, which I should like to see.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator if he looks forward with confidence to the time when the bill will be so amended as to accomplish the objectives which he has in mind.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much. I know of the solicitude of the able Senator from Missouri for raising the salaries of teachers, and of his excellent efforts—with which he allowed me to be associated—to give the school teachers the benefit of income-tax deductions for expenditures which they make in the summer taking additional training which they are required to take, or find it advantageous to take.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I seem to have failed to make myself clear. I appreciate the very graceful compliment of the Senator from Florida; but what I asked him was whether, if this bill should become law, he looks forward with confidence to the time when the objectives which he has in mind with reference to teachers' salaries will be accomplished.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sorry that I did not catch the full import of the able Senator's inquiry. I do look forward to that time. I feel that this is not the ultimate. This is simply the first step forward. I remember that on one occasion Mr. Baruch referred to something which President Roosevelt did as "a halting step forward." This may be a step more modest than we would like to take, but it is a tremendous step forward as compared with the past. I look forward with confidence to the time when all aspects of this problem will be so adequately met by the Congress that we shall give to the teacher the salary which he or she should receive, and provide for the education of the Nation's children all the money which can be wisely spent for that purpose.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I know the Senator claims no gifts of prophecy; but I should like to ask him whether he feels that if this bill becomes law, he can look forward with confidence to the time when certain standards of minimum salaries in all the States will be enforced by a bureaucracy in Washington.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; I make a distinction between Federal aid to public schools and the support, for example, of the personnel of the States, counties, and municipalities to carry on the functions in those political subdivisions.

Mr. President, America cannot be strong unless it has a strong citizenship, and that strong citizenship must be distributed all over the Nation. Therefore, the Nation itself is vitally interested in every boy and girl, whether he be in one of the great metropolitan districts of the land or whether he be upon a bald mountainside or whether he be somewhere in the remote recesses of one of the agricultural areas of the Nation. It is the Nation's concern to see to it that the children of the Nation are adequately equipped for the future and made strong, so that they can serve the country's security and progress.

Mr. KEM. I quite agree with the able Senator.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether he feels that the standards he has in mind will be self-enforcing?

Mr. PEPPER. They will not be self-enforcing. They will require the enlightened support of Members of Congress in order to make them meaningful, of course.

Mr. KEM. And they will require, will they not, administration by bureaucrats in Washington?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Missouri would not wish to discredit and disparage either the competence or the high purpose of the faithful men and women of our Nation who, here in Washington and elsewhere throughout the country, are carrying on the important functions of our Government.

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

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do not wish to discredit their services to our Nation, but I do wish to say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Missouri permit me to yield at this time to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KEM. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, all I wish to say is that so far as I can judge, the administrative set-up in Washington required by this bill would not exceed three persons. So I do not think the general charges of bureaucracy would be justified. The only other group would be a field force of auditors to see to it that the schools were spending $50 per child.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in view of that authoritative statement by the Senator from Ohio, I should say that the Washington group should be called a triumvirate, rather than a bureaucracy.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether the set-up he has in mind would be the one under the present bill or the one under the situation to which the Senator from Florida looks forward with confidence.

Mr. TAFT. It would be the one under the present bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. With regard to the services of the men and women who work for the Government, Mr. President, I should like to say that no one appreciates them more than I do; but I do not wish to see their activities and services extended generally beyond their present limits. I think we have reached the point beyond which they can properly be stopped.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I was calling attention to the fact—and I thank my friends, but I am very anxious to keep a promise I made a few minutes ago that I would not take very long——

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

Mr. PEPPER. However, Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I appreciate the sincerity of purpose of the Senator from Missouri, and I appreciate what he has in mind. I wish to say that when we think of Washington and when criticisms are made of the governmental groups in Washington, it is easy to forget that in time of emergency, when it is a question of calling the young men of the country to its service in order to answer the emergency call, the Nation depends on Washington. But when it comes to a question of having some responsibility in Washington to prepare the young people of the country to answer an emergency call, then it is assumed by some persons that responsibility in Washington is all wrong. Under that theory, it would be all right to call the young people to service, and let them be killed on some foreign battlefield, and subsequently give them a white cross and bring back their bodies to this country, but it is assumed that it is all wrong for Washington to help them to do their duty.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I was about to say that the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I introduced Senate bill 1157 in 1947. It provides for Federal grants-in-aid beginning with the fiscal year 1948, to enable the States to provide an $800 increase in public-school teachers' salaries, over the salaries in the year 1941, and to pay a minimum of $1,800 a year, and $2,400 a year if a 4-year college course is required, provided that the grants shall not be used to reduce State or local expenditures for teachers' salaries, and providing, of course, for local, instead of Federal, control.

Mr. President, at this point I offer for the RECORD a copy of the Gallup poll appearing in the August 1, 1947, issue of the Washington Post. It is entitled "Three Out of Four Favor $2,400 Salary for Public-School Teachers."

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

THE GALLUP POLL—THREE OUT OF FOUR FAVOR $2,400 SALARY FOR PUBLIC-SCHOOL TEACHERS

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., July 31.—An overwhelming majority of American voters believe that public-school teachers should be paid at least $2,400 a year.

A national cross section was asked:

"It has been suggested that the lowest yearly wage which could be paid to any teacher in a public grade or high school anywhere in the United States should be $2,400 a year—that is, $200 a month. Do you agree or disagree with this idea?"

The response:

Agree	74 percent
Disagree	20 percent
No opinion	6 percent

California voters in 1946 approved a constitutional amendment fixing at $2,400 the minimum salary of all teachers in that State, which is the highest anywhere in the country. The actual California vote, 74 percent for approval, exactly parallels the results of the institutes current national poll. Several other States are planning to establish the same minimum.

When it comes to raising funds to make the minimum possible, 58 percent of the cross-section say they would be willing to pay higher taxes if necessary to pay teachers in their communities at least $2,400 a year. This response from almost 6 out of 10 voters is primarily a measure of the intensity with which people feel about higher wages for teachers, and is not related to any specific tax proposal.

Approval of the $2,400 minimum wage proposal is wide-spread throughout all parts of the population. Farmers give it a slightly higher majority than other occupational groups; more women that men approve it.

Those favoring the proposal cite the high cost of living as a principal reason. They also point out that establishing a minimum salary is probably the only way to raise teaching standards and that teachers have been underpaid for years.

Those disagreeing with the suggestion say that $200 a month is too high a figure, that living costs vary in different parts of the country, or that wages should be based on ability, training, and experience.

Previous institute surveys revealed that school teachers gained wide-spread public sympathy in their drive last winter for wage increases. In February 64 percent of the voters believed school teachers in their localities were not getting enough pay, compared to only 44 percent who held that view in September 1946.

Today teaching is far from a lucrative profession, with the average teacher receiving less than $45 weekly and 200,000 getting less than $25 a week. Educational authorities believe that $200 a month minimum will help reduce the shortage and turn-over of teachers and attract more qualified applicants for openings.

Mr. PEPPER. I also offer for the RECORD an article entitled "Taft Bill and Teacher Pay" appearing in the Portland Oregonian of May 5, 1947.

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

TAFT BILL AND TEACHER PAY

In his column on this page Wednesday and again Saturday, Walter Lippmann discussed the inadequacies of teacher salaries and reviewed the scale of appropriations in the Taft bill for aid to education. The Taft bill gained more attention than several other bills on the same general subject, probably because of the prominence of the Senator whose name it bears, because it is sponsored also by several other Senators of note and because in the preceding session the same bill was exhaustively studied by the Committee on Education and Labor, and indorsed by six of its members. It was reported out too late in that session for action.

But the Taft bill is designed, as Senator TAFT told Congress when he introduced it, "to assist the States to provide a minimum education in the poorest districts." How much it would affect teacher salaries in general, which have aroused so much concern, would require deep exploration to find out.

Apportionment of funds as provided in the bill would be to States unable after spending on schools 1.1 percent (upped to 2.5 percent after 2 years) of the income received by their people, to produce $40 per year for every child of 5 to 17, inclusive. A State receiving aid would be required to see that every school district within it had $40 from Federal and State sources per child, white or black, to spend during the year.

The bill does not put a floor under teacher salaries, or make specific provisions for salaries. Federal aid, however, would have to be spent for current expenses of school districts, which in the main are comprised of teacher salaries. The floor that is established is, as hitherto said, under the amount spent per pupil. Some States, it is admitted, would not receive any funds.

Directly to the point of raising teacher pay is a bill sponsored by Senator PEPPER. This bill would provide Federal funds to insure that teachers receive $800 more per year than

they received in 1941, put a floor of $2,400 under salaries of teachers with 4 years of college training, and a floor of $1,800 under salaries of teachers with less training.

Another bill under the same authorship would allow teachers an income-tax reduction for money paid for taking college courses required for employment or for advancement in grade.

The last-named bill reminds us of a suggestion made on this page some time ago of a way to bring the low teacher salaries up nearer to standard. It was that Congress grant income-tax exemptions on teacher pay up to a determined level. It would provide some relief for the underpaid—perhaps not adequate relief, but it would be immediate. As then pointed out it is probably too simple a procedure to gain congressional attention. Congress' direct action, if any, will be to have Government provide money to raise teacher pay and then take back a sizable chunk of it in taxes.

Mr. PEPPER. I also offer for the RECORD a statement appearing in the Tampa Tribune of November 12, 1947, showing, county by county, the range in pay for teachers in Florida having 4 years of college education.

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

HILLSBOROUGH SCALE FOR TEACHERS RANKS SEVENTH IN FLORIDA

RANGE BY COUNTIES

Following is the range of pay by county for teachers having 4 years of college:

Counties	*Pay range*
Alachus	$2,300–$2,800
Baker	2,300
Bay	2,184– 2,760
Bradford	2,100– 2,996
Brevard	2,000– 2,850
Broward	2,400– 3,300
Calhoun	2,400– 2,650
Charlotte	2,200– 2,900
Citrus	2,100– 2,850
Clay	(1)
Collier	[2] 1,289
Columbia	2,304– 2,784
Dade	(1)
De Soto	2,160– 2,590
Dixie	2,250– 2,850
Duval	2,050– 2,770
Escambia	2,100– 2,850
Flager	2,300– 2,700
Franklin	2,300– 2,720
Gadsden	2,280– 2,700
Gilchrist	2,100– 2,700
Glades	2,100– 3,200
Gulf	2,175– 2,925
Hamilton	2,550– 2,750
Hardee	2,165– 2,690
Hendry	2,250– 2,750
Hernando	2,400
Highlands	1,700– 3,000
Hillsborough	2,200– 3,000
Holmes	2,300– 2,700
Indian River	2,250– 2,850
Jackson	2,244– 2,760
Jefferson	2,200– 2,800
Lafayette	2,200– 2,700
Lake	1,550– 3,060
Lee	2,125– 3,025
Leon	(1)
Levy	2,300– 2,900
Liberty	2,550– 3,150
Madison	2,400– 2,820
Manatee	2,100– 2,650
Marion	2,200– 2,800
Martin	2,200– 2,790
Monroe	2,325– 3,100
Nassau	2,400– 2,650
Okaloosa	2,340– 2,640
Okeechobee	2,100– 2,700
Orange	2,430– 3,000
Oscelo	$2,250–$2,850
Palm Beach	2,000– 3,475
Pasco	2,250– 2,750
Pinellas	(1)
Polk	(1)
Putnam	2,000– 2,600
St. Johns	2,000– 2,700
St. Lucie	2,040– 2,760
Santa Rosa	2,400– 2,700
Sarasota	2,200– 3,200
Seminole	2,000– 2,600
Sumter	2,166– 2,750
Suwannee	2,172– 2,820
Taylor	2,300– 2,800
Union	2,450– 2,550
Volusia	2,004– 2,880
Wakulla	2,400– 2,650
Walton	2,250– 2,600
Washington	2,400– 2,904

Footnotes at end of table.

[1] Not shown.
[2] Minimum.

The foregoing figures compare with $2,550 as the average set in the school bill for 4-year teachers, part of the money to come from the State and part from the counties under a set-up that is not easily understood.

PAY FOR EXPERIENCE

The figures, however, show that most counties are paying something extra for experience or other qualifications.

The taxpayer usually is generous toward school needs, the Journal said, although he also is likely to be feeling pressure from county and city officials who want to levy ample millage for their respective purposes.

It can be seen, therefore, that not only do counties pay from their own funds a part of the allotment for all teachers in all ranks, but also that the requirements on some counties are so extensive as to leave little or no margin with which to supplement salary schedules. And in the beginning it was proposed that they should be able to do this.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as I have said, the pending bill will not bring the millennium in education; it will not guarantee the minimum salaries which teachers are entitled to have. But it is magnificent progress in that direction, and it is up to us hereafter to carry on the splendid work which is being begun here by the pending proposed legislation.

Mr. President, my colleague will attest our pride—and a great deal of the credit goes to my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]—in what the State of Florida has done in the last 4 years to progress educational opportunity for the children of our State. My distinguished colleague, while he was governor, appointed a citizens' committee to make a study of what had been done in our State. A good statement of that program, giving due credit to my colleague and also to our present distinguished governor, appears in the National Education Association Journal for December 1947. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

FLORIDA—FORWARD IN EDUCATION

In the past year the people of Florida have brought their educational system into the national limelight. They have served notice that Florida will be satisfied with only the best of educational facilities and conditions.

In November 1944 Gov. SPESSARD HOLLAND (now United States Senator), with the cooperation of the present Governor, Millard Caldwell, and the State superintendent of public instruction, appointed by Executive order, the Florida Citizens Committee on Education to investigate Florida's educational system and to make recommendations for its improvement.

Our last comprehensive survey had been completed by out-of-State experts some 20 years ago, and, although the report was excellent, tangible results were negligible.

The citizens committee, composed of 15 lay citizens—representative of the various groups and areas of the State and including a lawyer, printer, insurance man, minister, two editors, and other citizens, only two of whom had had contact with educational systems—engaged in a survey of the educational needs of the State.

The committee invited the participation of a large number of lay citizens and professional educators from the State, including local school personnel and members of the State department of education, who were soon organized as study and advisory committees to deal with the major problems. Out-of-State consultants were selected to work with these committees and to advise with the citizens committee, but the reports and subsequent recommendations were considered and approved by the committee members.

County citizens were also encouraged to carry on studies of their own communities, and nine representative counties were selected to cooperate in intensive county studies.

Representatives of the citizens committee visited schools and communities throughout the State in search of information, checked with 26,000 laymen for suggestions and recommendations; conferred with out-of-State educators on other school programs; talked with bankers, lawyers, mechanics, farmers, policemen, salesmen, shopkeepers, newspapermen, and parents to find out what the people of Florida wanted for their children.

Just prior to the convening of the 1947 Florida Legislature the committee published three reports of its activities, findings, and recommendations.

A complete, comprehensive report, Education and the Future of Florida, was published. Twelve thousand copies of a 96-page report, including 32 pages of illustrations, were printed and distributed. A special 32-page, two-color, illustrated report aimed at the layman-reader, was also prepared and 31,000 copies distributed throughout the State. The demand for these reports was great.

Summaries of the report were prepared, mimeographed, and sent to Florida daily newspapers in advance of the scheduled release dates, thus allowing editors sufficient time to familiarize themselves with the report. The releases, prepared especially for this purpose, were distributed at the rate of four a week for 5 weeks. Special condensed reports were also prepared for the State's almost 200 weekly newspapers.

Study groups were organized throughout the State to study the recommendations. A voluntary group, the Florida Forward Through Education Committee, spearheaded by the Florida Chamber of Commerce, the Florida Parent-Teachers Association, local civic groups, and other lay organizations, was organized to stimulate meetings and discussions. The Forward Through Education Committee acted as a clearinghouse for providing speakers and answering questions concerning Florida's educational position and the recommended improvements.

Practically all the newspapers cooperated wholeheartedly, with the result that the people were familiar with the major findings of the committee and were able to judge skillfully the worth of the report and to give their support to the legislation which had been prepared to enact the recommendations into law.

Many newspapers conducted vigorous campaigns, assigning special staff writers and artists to coverage of the report, the committee's activities, and the progress of the State-wide campaign. Volumes of newspaper space were devoted to the State campaign.

By the time the legislature convened last year it was evident that the time had arrived to face the issues and solve the many problems facing education. It was evident, too, that citizens would not be satisfied with a few small improvements, that they were going to insist on whatever steps were necessary to provide the type of educational program they wanted for their children.

All the major bills submitted to the legislature were approved by practically unanimous vote. The legislature ably interpreting what was clearly the will of the people, thus took the necessary steps to insure the people of Florida of the best educational opportunities, facilities, and conditions.

Here is what an aroused and informed citizenry has accomplished:

1. The State appropriation for public schools has not only been doubled but has been placed on a unit basis so that the funds provided will increase as attendance and training of teachers increase.

2. A comprehensive minimum foundation program in which every county participates has been established. This program provides for all minimum essentials of a balanced program, including instructional salaries, transportation, other current expenses, capital outlay, and debt service. All needs can be developed in proper relationship without distortion or neglect of any phase such as is commonly encountered in State-aid programs.

3. In determining the amount required for instructional salaries, an apportioning schedule has been established which assures greatly increased funds to each county when better-trained teachers are employed. Rather than adopting a State minimum salary schedule, Florida has established an apportioning plan which requires counties to develop sound salary schedules. This assures that teachers in each rank according to training and certification will be paid the average represented by the apportioning schedule, even in the poorest counties. The amount included ranges up to $3,600 a year as an average for persons with certificates based on 2 years of graduate work beyond an A. B. degree, many counties paying more.

4. As a part of the minimum foundation program, instructional units are authorized for teachers of exceptional children, adult classes, and vocational education. Provision is also made for kindergartens and junior colleges. Thus vocational education is recognized as an integral part of the foundation program and the necessity for a separate State appropriation for vocational education is eliminated.

5. Beginning January 1, 1948, all special tax districts in each county will be combined into one district. More than 700 separate taxing districts which previously existed will be reduced to 67.

6. Ten months of service are required for all members of the instructional staff. In each county there will be ample opportunity for planning in advance of the opening of schools and again after schools have closed. An educational program built around the interests and needs of the community and its children has become possible for the first time. A minimum of 180 actual teaching days is now required. Approximately one-eighth of the personnel can be employed on a year-round basis in all counties which desire to develop year-round service programs. The apportionment to the county is increased proportionally for each qualified person employed on a bona fide 12-month service basis.

7. All counties are required to have five-member, policy-determining boards in place of the three-member boards previously found in most counties. Board members are to be nominated and elected from resident districts by county-wide vote rather than district vote, and salaries for board members are to be eliminated at the expiration of present terms.

8. The number of scholarships for prospective teachers has been increased to approximately 1,000 annually. Half of these provide $400 a year and the other half, $200. They are awarded on the basis of competitive examinations. Summer-school scholarships at $75 per person are available for about one-fourth of the teachers each year.

9. A Teacher Education Advisory Council has been established to study and make recommendations for further improvements in teacher education.

10. All county superintendents of public instruction will be required to have certificates based on college graduation. Previously there had been no professional requirements for county superintendents.

11. General improvements have been made in the retirement system and a floor of $75 a month has been established for all teachers who have rendered 30 years of service. The maximum retirement allowance has been raised to $1,800 for those whose average salary during the 10 best years has been $3,600 or more. An optional plan has been authorized permitting teachers with 25 years of service to retire at 50 years of age.

12. Sick leave for teachers has been extended to 6 days a year, cumulative to a total of 72 days over a period of 12 years. Continuing contracts are authorized for teachers who are college graduates.

13. A university system has been established which is now entirely co-educational. The name of Florida State College for Women has been changed to Florida State University.

14. Appropriations for the institutions of higher learning have been greatly increased, with the result that salaries for professors now range up to $7,500 a year, thus enabling institutions to develop strong faculties.

15. The board of control has been authorized to contract with institutions in other States for the education of Florida students in areas in which education could not economically be provided in Florida. An appropriation of $100,000 a year for scholarships for students to be served at regional institutions has been provided.

Numerous other improvements have been made, but greatest of all has been the lifting of morale and the establishment, in the minds of lay citizens and teachers alike, of the idea that Florida is determined to have a much better program of education and that major improvements in all areas are expected during coming months.

Florida's success has been the result of a comprehensive and sincere study and the interest and support of the people of the State. Florida has succeeded in accomplishing in one legislative session that which ordinarily takes years to complete.

The people of Florida, awakened to the necessity of continuous public support of the school system, are now justly proud of the improvements made in the educational system serving their State.

THE FLORIDA SCHOOL PROGRAM, 1947–49

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the total additional cost of the program for a 2-year period will be about $65,000,000 and this represents about a doubling of State funds for this purpose. It has varied from $32,000,000 to $34,000,000 in recent years.

The cost to the State for 1947–48 is estimated at $38,688,054 and to the counties $11,265,604.

The State money for 1947–48 will be expended as follows:

For teachers' salaries, $29,089,835.
School construction and debt payment, $3,890,265.
Current operating expenses, $3,935,227.
School bus transportation, $1,727,765.

The major emphasis of the program is on teacher qualifications and more teachers. The teacher shortage has been cut down.

TEACHER NEEDS IN FLORIDA

We shall need about 1,100,000 additional public school teachers by 1960 and 350,000 new classrooms by the same date, above the 1946 level.

The United States schools actually had 14,361 vacancies for teachers in 1946–47 and 7,633 in 1947–48. In 1946–47 Florida had 200 such vacancies and 100 in 1947–48.

However, the National Education Association estimates that Florida in 1947–48 also needs 1,100 qualified teachers who are needed to replace untrained emergency teachers and to reduce the present teacher load per pupil to the 1940–41 level. These figures do not reflect the total number of teachers needed above those now employed. The estimate represents needed replacements. Florida issued 3,000 emergency certificates in 1946–47 and about 1,100 in 1947–48.

Florida had 15,050 in 1946–47 and an estimated 15,760 in 1947–48.

As a result of teacher vacancies and shutdowns of classrooms, it is estimated that at least 1,000 Florida children are being deprived of schooling. But student enrollments in Florida were 428,489 in 1946–47 and 449,442 in 1947–48.

In 1947 State legislatures added $350,000,000 to teachers' salaries.

	Salaries all staff members and teachers	
	1946–47	1947–48
Florida	$1,939	$2,715
United States	[1] 2,250	[1] 2,550

[1] Estimated.

In 1945–46 Florida ranked twenty-fifth in terms of the average salary paid to the entire instructional staff—Florida averaged $1,719 compared with $2,000 for the United States.

In 1946–47 Florida ranked twenty-fifth, and in 1947–48, sixteenth.

The purchasing power of teachers' salaries in the United States in 1947–48 was only $1,594—based on 1935–39 cost-of-living base—and after taking into account taxes, only $1,438 compared with an average of $1,441 in 1939–40.

SCHOOL EXPENDITURES

The National Education Association in a recent survey pointed out—

(a) In the United States, and in more than three-fourths of the individual States, school boards had less purchasing power per pupil in 1947.

(b) Assuming that school expenditures per pupil between 1939–40 and 1946–47

should have risen as much as average annual earnings per full-time employee in private industry, 86 percent, we should be spending in the Nation $112 per pupil instead of $99 in 1946–47. Florida, unlike most States, is spending $83 per pupil in 1947 compared with $84 if it were to restore education to the 1939–40 level.

(c) The median percent increase in public school expenditures from 1939–40 to 1946–47 was 66 percent for the country and 84 percent for Florida in the same period.

(d) The median amount spent per pupil in the United States for school support was $60 in 1939–40 and $99 in 1946–47. The range for Florida was $45 in 1939–40 and $83 in 1946–47. The range for school boards in 1946–47 was about $20 for the lowest to $140 for the highest. Two hundred dollars is the minimum desirable amount according to the NEA.

EXPENDITURES AND FINANCING

The general condition of State finances has raised the question as to whether the States will be able to meet their continuing education needs without Federal aid. At the end of the 1946 fiscal year, Florida had an unobligated balance of State funds equal to $38,408,000. And in 39 States the total of surplus revenues was $1,854,712,616, but plans had been made to use all but $732,551,846 (or 39 percent) of the $1,122,000,000 to be expended. Only $68,000,000 (or 3.7 percent) was to be expended for elementary and secondary school purposes.

It has been estimated by the National Education Association that Florida would have needed for the fiscal year 1946 to spend $10,014,660 to raise its school expenditures to $116 per pupil in average daily attendance, the United States average in 1943–44, and the amount of its surplus not allocated to specific purposes was $14,761,836, so that Florida could have used its surplus to reach the national average. But this surplus could not entirely be allotted to public-school education without completely ignoring other vital public services. There is little evidence that the Florida surplus will continue for many years and once they are spent for even 1 year, nothing would be left to meet continuing needs of public education in Florida.

Estimates of per capita payments measure a State's relative fiscal capacity fairly well. Under S. 472, the allotment is based on the number of school children 5 to 17 and shall be the excess over $45 per child divided by 1 percent of the 5-year average annual increase, or $5 per child, whichever is greater. In order to be eligible the State must spend 2.5 percent of its average annual income for a 5-year period, and after 4 years, must spend 2 percent of its annual income payments, or $120 per pupil, whichever is the lesser.

	Total revenue for public education 1943–44	Sources (percent)			Total revenue per child 5 to 17
		Local	State	Federal	
Florida	$32,171,672	57.2	40.7	2.1	$71.18
United Stotes	2,604,048,806	65.6	33.0	1.4	90.01

	Total expenditures 1944–45	Amount per pupil of average daily attendance		
		Current expenses	Capital outlay	Total
Florida	$33,716,632	$94.55	$3.77	$104.66
United States	2,629,939,657	125.41	3.87	134.14

	1945 income per capita	Income per child 5 to 17	Percent 1944–45 current expense is to total income payments	Percent current expenses to State tax revenues
Florida	$1,049	$5,463	1.26	40.2
United States	1,177	5,372	1.59	45.0

Yet, Mr. President, proud as we are of what our State has done, commendable as it is, our State would have almost to double what it is now spending per year under our advanced program for education in order to meet the standards that are ultimately to be achieved with Federal aid under this proposed legislation. That simply goes to show that although ours is, I think we may say, one of the progressive States of the Nation today in this field, nevertheless we need the kind of assistance that is offered under this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, it has been alleged that we cannot adopt a good policy in this Congress on this subject without subjecting ourselves to the detriment of a bad policy, as well. However, I deny that the Congress of the United States cannot legislate without doing that which is improper, and adding that on to that which may be good and desirable. Our committee has worked out a well-balanced program and policy in connection with this legislation. I think the debate has added to our understanding of the line of cleavage that we have followed in connection with this wise proposal.

I hope that those hereafter who would tamper with its provisions, who would alter its purposes, who would attempt to vary its machinery, will look back to the illuminating debate and to the discussion in the committee and to the outstanding report of the committee, to see what was in the minds of the supporters of this legislation, both in our committee which approved it and in the Senate generally, and in the minds of the Members of Congress who adopted it and launched it on a course of distinguished service to the American people.

Mr. President, this measure provides a program of equal educational opportunity—a program of Federal assistance, not Federal control. Under the proposed program we shall not be surrendering to the Federal Government the control of our local educational institutions; we shall not be giving to the Federal Government the power to determine who our teachers shall be and to tell us what they shall teach and what books they shall use or what other standards shall govern the maintenance of our educational program. If I thought the pending bill would give the Federal Government such power, I would not be speaking here now for the bill; I would be calling upon the Senate to defeat it.

Mr. President, we are simply doing here, in the Senate today, what we already have done in the States: namely, providing equalized opportunity to the Nation's school children to give—from those who have more to those who have least—the aid that will make it possible for all to have a decent standard of educational opportunity.

Let me say just this in conclusion: All the world looks today to this great Republic of ours, which has been so blessed by providence. It may be that we shall be the Atlas upon the strong shoulders of which a free world can exist and endure. Mr. President, the illiterate can hardly bear the responsibility of a citizen in this difficult and challenging world of today and tomorrow. The safety of democracy demands the very best of every man or woman, boy or girl, in our land and in our world.

Mr. President, let us not be satisfied with the limitations of the past. The fathers and the mothers who have not enjoyed an opportunity for an education are most diligent to see that their children receive that which they were denied. So, Mr. President, at long last the conscience of a Nation has been quickened and we are reaching down into the poorest community in America and taking a little boy and a little girl by the hand and taking them to a good school, in a decent school bus, giving them a competent teacher, with adequate equipment, in a satisfactory building, with the safeguards they are entitled to enjoy, and they are in the future to know with assurance that not only their community, their State, but this great throbbing America stands behind them in the certainty that they will receive a decent educational opportunity. Mr. President, that is democracy, and let us show the world that in America democracy is moving ahead; that not only by what we preach but by what we practice are we showing the dignity of man and what freedom means and what opportunity actually can be afforded to those who have the blessings of a democracy.

So, Mr. President, it will be a great day, as I said, for my State and my country and, I believe, through what we shall do to serve democracy, for the whole world, when the Senate shall soon, as I hope it will, pass this legislation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am strongly in favor of the pending bill. I think it is an excellent bill and I want to congratulate the senior Senator from Ohio for bringing it up and upon the excellent manner in which he has handled the bill on the floor.

Legislation of this kind has been before the Senate for many years. It has been thoroughly debated several times on the Senate floor, and, as was pointed out, it was before the Committee on Education and Labor for many years. I was on that committe before passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. We studied and reported the bill.

The Senator from Ohio and others have discussed the provisions of the bill so thoroughly that I do not think it necessary specifically to discuss it further. I wish to discuss generally the necessity and wisdom of the proposed legislation.

The failure of the American people to support public education adequately is, I believe, the most serious defect in our national life. When one examines the present status of public education it is evident that at some point in our history our people abandoned the precepts of our founding fathers regarding education.

In his Farewell Address, George Washington admonished his fellow countrymen to—

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge.

In 1787 Thomas Jefferson said:

Above all things, I hope the education of the common people will be attended to.

I think Thomas Jefferson's attitude and his words on education are especially appropriate, in view of the discussion which took place a few moments ago, led by the senior Senator from Virginia. I hold in my hand a volume which has not yet been offered for sale to the public but which has been just recently published by Dumas Malone, formerly a professor of the University of Virginia, presently at Columbia University. It is entitled "Jefferson the Virginian." I had not intended to quote from this book until the discussion occurred a few moments ago, in which so much emphasis was put upon conditions in the State of Virginia. But I think it worth while reading a few excerpts about Jefferson and his work in education. I read first the following paragraph:

In long retrospect, Americans have come to regard him—

That is, Jefferson—

as the chief prophet of public education in the first half-century of the Union; and it is doubtful if any other American name has been so often cited in popular addresses and writings on this perennially interesting subject. This is owing in part to the political eminence he attained, and partly to the apt sayings that are scattered through his collected writings. Some of the most famous of these quotations are from private letters, such as one to George Wythe from Paris in which he said: "Preach, my dear sir, a crusade against ignorance; establish and improve the law for educating the common people." Not until after his death could such sayings as these gain wide currency, and they might have remained forever unknown if he had been politically obscure.

Again we read:

His—

That is, Jefferson's—

greatest services were rendered to posterity, but his immediate activities stand out in sharp relief against their specific background of place and time. In colonial and revolutionary Virginia formal education was largely a private matter and its benefits were almost wholly restricted to the gentry. Judging from its fruits, including Jefferson himself, the system was better than he thought it. Its chief merit was that it produced capable leaders, and he was concerned that it should continue to do this, on the basis of a more rational plan. He was unquestionably correct in concluding that the existing system rested on a dangerously narrow base.

Jefferson, as we all know, built and founded the University of Virginia, but before that, and before he became very prominent, as he later did, he had introduced bills in the Legislature of Virginia providing a system of public schools for the State. I desire to read a few excerpts relating to that matter, as follows:

His emphasis was on public purposes. The most important of these was to guard the freedom and happiness of individual members of society, but he did not describe education here in terms of personal refinement and culture. Fear of tyranny, even though this was only incipient tyranny, was prominent if not predominant in his thought.

That particular passage seems to be especially appropriate in view of present conditions in the world.

He saw the most effective preventive in the illumination of minds of the people at large. He was particularly anxious to give them knowledge of the facts of history, in order that they would recognize dangerous political ambition in any shape.

Second only to his purpose to prevent tyranny and safeguard freedom was the desire to assure wise and honest government.

That seems rather strange in view of the statements that have been made on this floor today about the danger of the pending bill to the wisdom, honesty, and efficiency of the Government. From the debate which has taken place one would think the bill would undermine our Government.

I continue the quotation:

This necessitated the training of leaders. Nothing in his plan called for the diminution of the educational opportunities of those whose parents were able to pay for them. However, he expected that some of these fortunate persons would prove unworthy to receive and unable to guard the sacred deposit of the rights and liberties of their fellow citizens; and he was convinced that it was folly to leave the public welfare dependent on the accidental circumstances of wealth or birth. Accordingly, he sought to make higher schooling available without charge to selected youths of marked native ability who would emerge from the unprivileged groups.

He introduced a bill providing for two levels of schooling in Virginia.

The hundred schools, which we should call primary, were to serve relatively small districts or hundreds, and were designed to effect his purposes of general public enlightenment. Three years of education were to be given gratis to all white children, male and female. However, these schools were not to be wholly public, for any child whose parents could pay for him might stay longer if he liked.

On the next level there were to be grammar schools, set up in districts including several counties.

I think his ideas are quite analogous to the purposes of the bill, namely, that elementary and secondary education is the real concern of the bill, and very properly so, I believe.

I continue reading from the book:

These proposals reveal him as a realistic and discriminating Democrat, or as an informed and critical aristocrat—whichever term may be preferred. His concern was to broaden the educational base of society and, at the same time, to search out and utilize for the public good the aristocracy of worth and genius which he afterward described as "the most precious gift of nature." He tried to frame a comprehensive program. "The general objects of this law," he said, "are to provide an education adapted to the years, to the capacity, and the condition of everyone, and directed to their freedom and happiness." He expected no utopia overnight but he was convinced that he was on the right track. In later years his American countrymen had no doubt he was, though they were more disposed than he to emphasize quantity for its own sake and more reluctant to apply selective standards at any stage of the educational process. * * *

On half a dozen counts Jefferson showed himself in this bill to be an American prophet in the field of higher education. He himself believed that it was defeated by the dissenting sects; but they still looked with disfavor upon an institution which had been historically Anglican, and their fears were not allayed by his amendments. He was not permitted to transform the college into a genuinely public institution or to enlarge its faculty.

That relates to his efforts with regard to the college at Williamsburg, the College of William and Mary.

I recommend this book very sincerely to anyone interested either in Jefferson or in education. It is one of the finest books which has come to my attention. I wish there were time for me to read the remainder of the passage relating to his interest in education. The thought struck me that it seemed a little bit odd that in those days, when Jefferson was carrying the torch of education in this country, and that today the people of Virginia have such a high regard for him, the leadership in opposition to the bill comes from the Senators from Virginia.

Mr. President, can anyone seriously maintain that today the people of this Nation regard the education of the common people as an object of primary importance?

In 1945 we spent in this country $7,700,000,000 for alcoholic beverages, $3,000,000,000 for tobacco and only slightly less on toilet preparations, beauty and barershop services. In that same year we spent two and one-half billion on our elementary and secondary schools, approximately one-third as much as was spent for whisky and other delightful, perhaps, but scarcely essential products.

During the last hundred and fifty years, something has upset our sense of values. In the early days of this Republic education was, as I have indicated above, a matter of primary importance. Today, judging from the actual conditions in the teaching profession, the education of our children certainly has no priority on our money or our thoughts.

As an example of the relative importance which is attached to the teaching profession, Mr. Benjamin Fine in his book, Our Children Are Cheated, page 45, cites the way the city of Detroit, one of our richest communities, rewards its public servants:

The prison cook gets a beginning salary of $2,736 in Detroit (the city jail); comfort-station attendants in any of the city's numerous comfort stations get $2,222. The dog catcher gets $2,485, and in a short time is able to receive a salary of $3,120. The zoo's animal keepers get $2,496 at the start, for their ability to feed the tigers and keep away from their paws. The garbage-collector foremen get $4,761 and by showing improvement and regular attendance, interest in their job, and similar traits, can eventually reach $5,238. The rat-exterminator foreman begins at $3,095 and whether or not he kills his quota of rats he can easily reach a maximum of $3,492.

Detroit's school teachers, in common with teachers everywhere, do not fare so well as many of these people. They begin at a salary of $2,094, only after they have completed a minimum of 4 years of college and have shown unusual ability in guiding children, plus a superior knowledge of one or more specific subjects. In terms of take-home pay, Detroit teachers receive slightly in excess of $8.25 a day on a 20 days per month basis.

Or take New Orleans; the dog catcher gets from $1,500 to $1,820 a year depending on his speed. * * * The zoo keepers' standard salary is $2,400 a year. The teacher starts at $1,400 per year. (See further figures, p. 46.)

Mr. President, there are many more interesting statistics in this book from many parts of the country, but I do not think I need labor the point that teachers, generally speaking, receive substantially less reward for their services than do doctors, lawyers, carpenters, plumbers, truck drivers, or dog catchers.

I realize that our time is growing short and, like the leadership of the majority, I am anxious to bring this measure to a vote.

A great deal is said in this Senate and in other forums about certain defects in our society. It seems to me that the fundamental defect in our society, the defect from which many of the other defects arise, is the lack of adequate educational opportunities for our children. If our country is not to be ruled by irrational whims or blind prejudice, our citizens must have some understanding of the social and political principles and institutions which are the sacred heritage of our people.

Mr. President, we have been in a kind of stalemate. We have needed support for public education from the Nation as a whole, but because of the lack of sufficient or proper education of the people and their representatives, we have been unable to obtain the required governmental support. It is a vicious circle which in some manner must be broken, or, through ignorance and indifference, we shall risk the loss of our democracy.

It took a war to dramatize our deficiency in education, and, in fact, to increase it to the point where we can no longer tolerate it, nor ignore the responsibility of the Federal Government to do something about it.

In the State of Arkansas, at the outbreak of the war, the average preparation of teachers was 2.6 college years. This average had dropped to 1.9 years in 1943. From 1940 to 1945 the number of teachers employed dropped from 13,173 to 12,650, a total of 523 positions discontinued during the period of the war. Some of this loss, of course, was attributable to shifting population, but in the main it was caused by inability to secure teachers for the salaries offered.

By 1945 over 50 percent of the prewar teaching staff of the State had left the profession.

To replace these lost teachers, the State Department of Education was compelled to accept applicants who could not meet normal requirements. Seventy-two percent of the replacements were persons who had completed less than 12 semester hours of college work.

In a normal year, the schools of Arkansas need from 1,000 to 1,200 replacements for those who die, retire, or for other reasons leave the teaching profession. Yet in 1944, only 288 people were trained for teaching in Arkansas, and only 25 percent of this number actually went into teaching.

The teacher shortage is so serious, not merely because there are fewer teachers, but because there are more children. From 1941 to 1946, about 13,000,000 babies were born, as against population experts' predictions of 9,000,000. Last year this wartime birth rate made itself felt in the Nation's schools. Even if the birth rate drops—and there is as yet no sign of it—enrollments in elementary schools will increase rapidly until 1950. By 1953 the high schools will feel the surge and must continue to expand until 1960.

And, as always, the States with the smallest incomes had the most children in the population. In 1943, for each 1,000 people in the country as a whole, there were 216 children aged 5 to 17. Arkansas, which ranked forty-seventh in per capita income with about one-half the national figure, had 259 children per 1,000 population, while California, with the highest national income, had 172 per 1,000.

The prime reason for the teacher shortage is lack of money. Public school teachers from 1939 to 1946 suffered a 20 percent loss in real wages.

Last year it was estimated that the national average salary paid to factory workers was $2,440. For teachers it was $2,100. The average salary paid to teachers in Arkansas was $1,450, which is about $300 less than the average industrial wage in the State.

Of course, the teacher shortage—the difficulty in securing and retaining competent teachers—is the most important shortcoming in the system.

But physical equipment has its importance too. Not only for its own sake, but also because it is one of the few things which, when adequate, encourages a person to make the sacrifice of entering the teaching profession. Good working conditions, including good buildings, cafeterias, classrooms, offices, and so forth, are necesary to the pupil for his own sake, and in order to make the teaching profession more attractive to those who would enter it.

Yet, of the 406,000 pupils attending school in Arkansas, 50 percent are housed in poorly constructed, overcrowded classrooms because of lack of funds to provide adequate buildings.

Mr. Ralph B. Jones, State commissioner of education for the State of Arkansas, made the following statement to the Senate committee on April 22, 1947:

Take my own State, for example, which is quite typical of many of the 48 comprising this Nation. There we have a population of educable youth, by actual house-to-house enumeration, amounting to 446,000 between the ages of 6 and 17 years, inclusive. The total enrollment last year 1945–46, in all schools of all types and classes was 406,000, leaving 40,000 educable youth in one State alone who were not in any school of any kind during that year. This is 10 percent of our future social and economic productivity which must not only be written off as a total loss but, in addition, must be carried as dead weight by the other 90 percent.

However, the picture darkens as we look a little further. The average in daily attendance for the same year was 322,000, leaving 118,000 who either were not in school at all or attended so irregularly as to gain very little, if any, benefit. That's 26 percent of future productivity to be written off as loss.

Some States are rich, some poor, and to a large degree a child's education depends on the place where it is born.

In 1944 Arkansas ranked forty-seventh in average annual salaries paid teachers; in annual expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance, and forty-sixth in value of school property per pupil.

I do not want to leave the impression that Arkansas has failed to realize its responsibility as a State in the education of its children. According to the report of the committee on S. 472, the State of Arkansas, from 1941 to 1945, spent 1.92 percent of its income for public elementary and secondary education, as against a national average of 1.87 percent.

In 1946, and again in 1947, 2.3 percent of the total income payments of people of the State of Arkansas was spent on public-school services. From 1937 to 1947 Arkansas increased its teachers' salaries from $534 to $1,450. From 1939–40 to 1944–45 Arkansas increased its expenditures for public education by 92.22 percent, the second highest increase in the Nation, as against a national average of 42.37 percent. In spite of this fact, however, at the end of that period, in 1944–45 the State of Arkansas ranked forty-fifth among the States in amount expended per child between the ages of 5 to 17.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I have been listening to the argument of the Senator from Arkansas. As I understand, his argument is that there are certain deficiencies in the educational systems in his State and in other States, and he feels that something should be done about it, and that therefore the Federal Government should intervene. I should like to ask him if he does not agree that keeping the peace is an important function of government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly do.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator agree that if the peace is not being kept in a State, the Federal Government should intervene?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought the Senator meant peace among nations.

Mr. KEM. Oh, no.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sorry I misunderstood the import of the Senator's question. The Senator was referring to the police power keeping the peace within a State?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly do think it should be kept.

Mr. KEM. What distinction would the Senator draw between the function of keeping the peace and the function of education?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The first distinction is that I think the States are doing

a very excellent job of keeping the peace within their borders, generally speaking. I would not wish to extend that to the Senator's State, but I would make that statement as to Arkansas.

Mr. KEM. The Senator realizes that there is a difference of opinion in that respect, does he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that, generally speaking, the peace is very well kept, except in a few metropolitan areas where there are gangs. I would say that in Arkansas it is very satisfactorily kept, very well kept.

Mr. KEM. Assuming that the peace is not kept in some State other than the State of Arkansas, would the Senator be willing that the Federal Government intervene, and that appropriations be made for keeping the peace in that State?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would say that if there were a revolution and a complete break-down of the government of a State, that would be quite necessary. I think that is a wholly fictitious and unlikely supposition.

I do not wish to be personal about it, but I recall certain States and certain cities where the local government was unable to bring criminals to justice, and I am thinking particularly of the notorious Al Capone. In that case the Federal Government did intervene, and did bring to justice Mr. Al Capone. No one objected to that. I do not believe the Senator from Missouri would object to that.

Mr. KEM. That was for the evasion of income taxes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the real crime of Mr. Capone was much greater than his evasion of income taxes.

Mr. KEM. What I am asking the Senator is whether, if the function of keeping the civil peace were not being properly discharged, he would be willing to have Federal appropriations made for that purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know that I can answer any further than to say that if the governments within the States break down to the point where lives and health and welfare of the people are being endangered, and local governments will not function, the Federal Government should do something about it.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator say that should apply to citizens of color, as well as white citizens?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the question?

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator have in mind protection being accorded to citizens of color, as well as citizens of the white race?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; every one.

Mr. KEM. Then, the Senator would have no objection to the intervention of Federal agencies to keep the peace under the circumstances to which he has referred?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may add that neither the Federal Government nor a State is going to keep the peace perfectly so that there will be no crime at all. I would say that as a general condition, as we understand the difficulties which arise where men live together, the peace has been kept and is being kept in my State, and in most of the States, certainly those in the South. I presume the Senator is indirectly referring to something like the antilynching law. If I take my own State as an example, there has not been a lynching there in 20 years. I dare say that in the great city where the Senator lives there will be two murders to every comparable crime in my whole State. That is a relative matter. I am not advocating that the Federal Government take over the police power in Missouri or in any other State.

In spite of the fact that there are crimes in other States, I think that, generally speaking, the States do as good a job as could be expected where men live together as we do. At least I am not aware of any great complaint about that, except in an election year, when men are trying to get some votes. That is the real significance of those particular efforts, I think.

To continue with the thought I have with regard to the effort Arkansas is making, the statistics I have read show that the State of Arkansas makes a relatively greater effort, in terms of taxpaying ability, than do the States of New York, New Jersey, California, and Connecticut, for example, although those States rank among the highest in current expenditure per pupil, and Arkansas ranks among the lowest.

I have attempted to show the problems of the State of Arkansas, its relative position in terms of need and in terms of its effort, not only because it is the State I represent, but also because it is one of the poorest, and because it exemplifies the acute need of Federal recognition and assistance in the field of education.

As I have said, a child's education depends in a large degree on the place where it is born. But an illiterate American is not merely a liability to the locality in which he momentarily lives, but he is a burden upon the entire Nation. This is true in times of peace as in war. The welfare of the Nation as a whole, as well as that of the States and communities, is directly dependent upon the quality of the education of all its citizens.

I may say that we are often misled by the fact that there is a great quantity of education in this country, but the quality is extremely low, particularly in those places where there is some kind of education in the sense that children at least attend school though I think the quality leaves much to be desired even in the richer States.

It is highly appropriate that we take up this measure as we become alerted to the danger of another war.

Education is the one factor of greatest importance in preserving peace, and I doubt if any institution or function of government is as important in terms of a nation's ability to wage war.

The President's Commission on Universal Training recognized this fact, I believe, when it listed, "A strong healthy, educated population" as the prime essential of an integrated national security program.

It is a rather strange commentary on our sense of values that so many people accept without alarm the proposal for universal military training, costing $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000, but balk at $300,000,000 for education. I think that unconsciously many people support the universal military training program because they know of the defects and shortcomings in our established public education system.

The war clearly disclosed the country's deficiency in education for national defense purposes. There are 10,000,000 illiterate people in the United States. The Selective Service turned down 676,000 young men for educational deficiency, comprising 8 percent of those examined. Three hundred and fifty thousand registrants under selective service signed their names with a mark.

These facts, however, by no means show the true importance of education to national defense manpower problems. There are no statistics to show the number of physical rejections occasioned by lack of education. How many of these were attributable to the lack of an elementary knowledge of hygiene as taught in public schools? How much money was spent and how much time was lost by the armed forces in training which an adequate school system could have provided?

Of course, these are merely the superfical aspects of the importance of education to the Nation's war potential. The real importance cannot be measured in dollars nor in statistics. Nevertheless education, based upon a sound public-school system, is the very foundation for the conservation and development of our human resources. And, as materials are developed by the application of knowledge to natural resources, so is education the basis for production of goods for war and peace.

In this connection, I think it well to note that, according to Benjamin Fine, education editor of the New York Times, in 1946 while this country spent 1.5 percent of its national income for education, the Soviet Union averaged around 8 percent of its total income for education. That is a factor that all those who spend so much time berating communism should ponder over.

It is a strange thing to me that so many persons, and the same ones who are so strong in their condemnation of communism, at the same time see no merit in this bill and the program provided by it, which, I think would be clear to anyone, is the greatest defense against the spread of communism.

The importance of the public-school system as a basis for peace cannot be overemphasized. As prejudice is founded on ignorance, so does understanding arise from education. This country can carry its heavy international obligations only so long as all citizens understand the nature of and reasons for them.

The United States Chamber of Commerce, in 1944, made a study of the effect of education on living standards. The concluding paragraph of that study is as follows:

> The only sure way to raise the level of living of any country is to find more efficient ways of producing goods and services. This means more and more technical training

and more general education for all. From one standpoint, if a country or a community is already rich, it is easy for it to become richer. It has the margin of resources necessary to devote to increasing the efficiency of production. We have scarcely started to look for the most efficient means of producing food, or clothing, or housing, or any one of a thousand necessities or conveniences. New products to be found will make present ones seem crude. To find these improved methods and products will require far more research and technical training than any country now provides. The country that is really daring in its use of research, and greatly increases its provisions for education, will rapidly increase its level of income. This is the only sure way for a rich country to become richer, and it is one that we have hardly started to develop in the United States.

This statement clearly shows that the cost of the legislation is nothing compared with the benefits which are bound to accrue from it.

Education is a sound investment, which, in terms of dollars, will pay off at a higher rate than any other investment the Government has ever made.

Mr. President, as the most fortunate and most powerful nation of the western world, we are rightfully expected to exercise a wise leadership in these difficult and trying times. We have shown leadership in war and in the development of the physical sciences and technology, but the task now confronting us is to reestablish peace and harmony among the peoples of the world.

Today, we are fighting a war of ideas with the Communists. To understand and to give leadership in this war of ideas, we most assuredly must have an intelligent and well educated citizenry as well as wise leaders. If we are to unite and lead the western world in its struggle against the domination of Communist totalitarians, I believe we must give every American boy and girl a reasonably good education. How can we expect to win over the long run if we are content to spend only one-fourth as much of our national income on educating our children as the Russians spend?

Mr. President, I conclude by quoting two short paragraphs from the excellent report of the committee, on page 6:

We cannot preserve the Republic at all unless the people are taught to read and to think so that they can understand its basic principles and the application of those principles to current problems. No man can be free who does not understand the opportunities which lie before him. No man can have equality of opportunity if he has not the knowledge to understand how to use the rights which may be conferred upon him in theory.

The most precious asset this Nation, or any nation, has is its children. To conserve and develop this human resource is the best insurance we can have for the future greatness and security of our Nation. Not only is education essential to economic welfare, but it is the major defense of liberty against totalitarianism.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope we will have a vote on the bill tonight, and that the Senate will overwhelmingly endorse it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I feel very strongly that the passage of the bill will mark the beginning of control of education by the Federal Government. I think the passage of the bill will lead to even larger appropriations in the future; that with those appropriations will go control which will do violence to the ancient and sacred traditions of this land with reference to the freedom of education.

No one will deny, Mr. President, that in a republic such as ours education is a first esesntial, and that every reasonable effort must be made to improve our educational system. However, to proceed upon the assumption that dollar expenditures per pupil alone are an adequate measure of the quality of education, and that Federal grants to States are necessary, indeed indispensable, to finance a proper educational system, is, in my opinion, unwarranted.

First, any exact relationship between school expenditures and the quantity and quality of education provided is yet to be proved. Indeed, there is ample evidence to indicate that in many cases haphazard school organization and inefficient school operations are a major contributing factor to costs which are in no way commensurate with the sort of education provided.

It is right here, Mr. President, that I feel that in the long run the principle of Federal control of local education is going to be established. I do not believe that the Congress can honestly and fairly make substantial appropriations, as it proposes to do under the bill, and as it no doubt will increasingly do in the future, without saying to the States that this money must be effectively and efficiently and honestly spent. I do not think we should say to a State, "Here is money from the Federal Treasury. Go ahead and spend it in any way you see fit." I think that is an improper use of tax moneys collected from all the other States and indeed from the very State that may conduct its educational system in an ineffective fashion.

For that reason, Mr. President, I believe that as we proceed with Federal grants to education, increasingly we are going to come to impose upon the States control over the manner in which that money is spent. That, Mr. President, is the entering wedge, and a very wide entering wedge at its base to Federal control of education.

For many years school authorities have insisted upon gaging educational achievement almost solely upon expenditures per pupil. Repeated questioning of this premise has yet to elicit any demonstrable proof that it is true, and the taxpayer has been expected to accept it blindly as an article of faith.

Secondly, experience in various States has shown the danger as well as the futility of approaching the problem of education from the standpoint of expenditures divorced from any standards of performance.

There, Mr. President, is where Federal control is going to enter again, because sooner or later, as these appropriations increase, the Federal Government is bound to say to the States, "You must do this, you must do that; we must insist upon certain standards." That has in the past gone with every Federal grant, and I think, of necessity, it must be so. It is the business of the Congress to see to it that Federal funds expended by the States and in the States are expended honestly, fairly, and effectively. To do anything less is to shirk our duty in the important matter of the honest, fair, and effective expenditure of Federal funds. Once we get into that field with education, we enter the field of the Federal control of education, which we have never had in this land.

I am in hearty accord with what the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said a short time ago, that in every police state control is obtained by taking over two important functions of government on the part of the dictator. One is the function of education. That is made a matter of control at top. The other is, of course, control of the police organizations of the localities. I believe that there are two respects in which we must always keep away from Federal control. One is in the field of education, and the other is the control of the local peace-enforcement agencies.

Experience with State grants points to the perpetuation of existing multiple districts and other substandard conditions through Federal grants if they are not coupled with mandatory standards.

Third, Senate bill 472 disclaims any intention of imposing Federal control. However, if Federal aid does not carry with it at least a provision for enforcing adequate standards with respect to efficient school administration, a dilemma is immediately created. For example, Connecticut does not desire Federal control of its educational system. Yet Connecticut, as one of the States which would contribute heavily to a Federal-aid program, cannot fairly be required to help subsidize education in other States without some assurance that such States have a real need for educational funds which they themselves are unable to provide—a real need in this case being a need which arises from inadequate resources, not merely from a dissipation of resources through unplanned and uneconomical administration. As I previously pointed out, when we enter that field we open the door to Federal control of education.

Mr. President, for the benefit of the RECORD I should like to state a few facts with respect to the State of Connecticut and the problem which she has had with education. I do not mean to imply that the people of the State of Connecticut resent having funds taken out of their pockets by Federal tax gatherers and spent in other States. We have been a part of the Federal Union for many years. As a matter of fact, there are only four States in the Union which have been in it longer than has the State of Connecticut.

Throughout all her history Connecticut has been paying into the Federal Treasury more than has ever come to her from it. We are glad to do so, because we recognize that the benefits we derive as a sovereign State from being a part of the Union more than outweigh any money we pay into the Federal Treasury. But it has been a solemn principle with us that when money is

collected for tax purposes it must be honestly, effectively, and efficiently spent. I say that these moneys for Federal aid to education cannot be honestly, effectively, and efficiently spent in every case and all the time unless there is some Federal control. That is where I want to draw the line in this important question of Federal aid to education.

What have we done with our own problem back home? Based upon computations according to the figures in the bill, there would be distributed to the States $226,335,000. Of this Connecticut would receive $1,705,000, and her taxpayers would be required to pay, as their share of financing the $226,335,000, the sum of $4,006,000. According to the present formula, 32 States would receive the minimum grant of $5 per child in average daily attendance. Had it not been for the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] we would have received less than $2.50 instead of the $5 per pupil.

Connecticut would be one of those 32 States. Therefore, in order to receive $1,705,000, we would be required to contribute $2,301,000 more for the support of education in other States. Mr. President, we do not resent doing that; we have done it all through our history; but we do insist that when it is done it be done under some form of control, so that we can be sure that the money is honestly, effectively, and efficiently spent. As I previously stated, we resent that kind of control in the important field of education.

In the past, as has been true of most of the States, Connecticut has been able to take care of her own educational requirements. For example, in 1943–44, for current expenses exclusive of expenditures for transportation, physically handicapped children, adult, and vocational education—and I may add that we have very substantial programs in those important fields—the people of Connecticut spent $31,294,305.42. In 1947–48, for the current year on the biennial budget, we spent $47,000,000, an increase of approximately $15,705,000, or 50 percent.

These total current expenses are financed by State grants, exclusive of aid for transportation, physically handicapped children, adult, and vocational education, amounting, in 1943–44, to $1,472,486.55, and in 1947–48 to $10,252,898.30.

At the last session of the General Assembly the State government stepped in with a new tax and made a very substantial increase in grants—in fact, an increase of nearly 600 percent in grants from State taxes to local education, in order to pay our teachers higher salaries, put our school buildings in better shape, and improve our educational system.

The local governments themselves also stepped into the breach. Local taxation and other miscellaneous revenues for education in 1943–44 were $29,821,819.07; in 1947–48 they were $36,747,101.70, or an increase of a little more than 23 percent. So through the years Connecticut has maintained an excellent educational system, and in the past few years she has greatly improved her system. She has spent substantially larger sums of money for educational needs within her borders, and she did it because she believed, and has always believed, that the problem of education was a local and State problem, and that it should be financed out of local and State funds. She believed that because she believed that education was one thing in which the Federal Government should never have any control. We in Connecticut want to continue along that road.

Mr. President, I would much rather vote in favor of a bill to take out of the Federal Treasury moneys to give to the States which need help. There are perhaps only 6 or 8 or 10 of them which I recognize do need this help. I should be glad to support legislation of that kind; but what are we doing? In order to get all the States in, we give 32 States $5 per pupil in order to win their support for this particular measure.

Mr. President, this bill is the opening wedge to Federal control of education; and I think we should consider the question very seriously and carefully before we take this all-important step.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate for long, before voting on this bill; but I should not wish this record to be closed without stating my position on this measure.

When I first ran for Congress, in 1936, I had in my platform a plank advocating Federal aid for education, without Federal control. During all the time I served in the House of Representatives, I worked for such legislation. It was my pleasure to serve as a member of the bipartisan steering committee in the House, in an effort to secure the enactment of such legislation. In April 1941, I testified before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in favor of legislation of this character. I have testified before the House committee at different times in favor of it.

I am delighted that we have come this far with the legislation here in the Senate. I join with the many other Members of the Senate who have expressed the hope that before this day comes to an end we may have approved this particular measure.

I am pleased that the bill comes to us without any so-called crippling or hampering amendments. I think one of the vital points in connection with Federal aid to education is that it shall be without Federal control, so that the respective States shall be left to operate their educational systems just as they are doing today. Certainly we are working with the very fundamentals of government when we provide means of educating the boys and girls who are to be the citizens who will control the destinies of this country. We have found that the system of local government, whereby the States, counties, and local school districts run the affairs of educating the youth of this land, is the best system. This bill, in the form in which it comes to us for final vote, preserves that system.

Mr. President, I strongly believe in Federal-aid programs generally, and particularly in Federal aid for education. In this country we have had a long history of granting aid from the Federal Government to the various States for a great many different activities, and I know of none in which the Federal Government should take a greater interest than that of seeing to it that the boys and girls in all sections of the United States have at least an opportunity to obtain an education that will enable them to compete on a fair basis with the boys and girls from every other section of the United States.

A few years ago, while I was a Member of the House of Representatives, it was my privilege to serve on a special committee which was created for the purpose of studying interstate migration. I think I have never had connection with any study that was more interesting than that one, and I know of nothing that fortified my belief in the need for Federal aid for education more than that study did. It enabled me, among other things, to appreciate the widespread movement of boys and girls brought up and trained in one part of the Nation to other sections. I remember that during those hearings Dr. Rupert Vance, of the University of North Carolina, testified, and I recall his reference to the Southeast as the seedbed of the Nation. I remember studying some charts which were issued by the Bureau of the Census, and I remember seeing on those charts an indication as to what happens in the United States when our boys and girls grow up to maturity, some of them to remain in the States in which they were born and where they were educated and trained, and many others to migrate to other States. That was a very interesting study of the map of the United States.

I have before me now the hearings held at that time before the Senate Committee on Labor and Education. It is impossible for all Members of the Senate to see the chart included in the hearings, but the shaded portion on the chart shows how heavily populated certain areas would be if there were no migration. It takes in generally the southeastern section of the United States and out through New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Idaho, and then includes the two Dakotas. Those are the States, generally speaking, according to the Census Bureau, that have a high reproduction rate. I recall that as a result of those studies, it was shown that whereas in some of the industrial areas of the United States, the rate of reproduction was only 80 percent, in the southeastern part of the United States it ran as high as 130 percent. That simply means that in that area we have a great number of boys and girls to bring up, to train, to educate, to prepare to become producers in life, who are not going to stay in those States. So we see that there is a natural siphon which forces migration from those high birth-rate States to the low birth-rate areas.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be a matter of simple justice that aid for education should be afforded by this great Federal Government of ours, which, after all, is established for the common good. Such a system of aid will be fair to the boys and girls themselves, in order that they may compete on an equal basis with boys and girls trained in richer areas. It will be fair to the States that have the

job of training and educating those boys and girls, because they are carrying the burden, whereas other States will enjoy the productive capacity of those young men and young women after they have grown up and have moved elsewhere. It will be fair to the States to which those young people move, in order that those States may have the benefit of a greater productive capacity on the part of those who have been trained in other areas.

Mr. President, I remember during those hearings asking an official of the State of Rhode Island whether he believed that we should have Federal aid for education. His answer was this:

> In your State if you raise mules and ship them out of the State, people in other States pay you for the expense of raising them. But you raise children, and have all of the expense of education and other facilities; and when they go to other States, the other States do not pay you anything for raising those children.

Mr. President, I think it is merely a matter of recognizing the fact that boys and girls are not necessarily going to continue to live in the States in which they grow up, but many of them are going to move to other parts of the United States.

I remember that a good many years ago when, in my State of Alabama, we first adopted what was called the equalization plan, there was a great deal of opposition to it, because the richer counties of the State naturally did not want to be paying taxes to help support schools in the poorer counties. We had considerable difficulty in getting that plan placed into operation. Nevertheless, the good sense of the people, who realized what the problem was, prevailed, and we put into effect an equalization plan. Since that time we have had no trouble with the plan. We have had no complaints from the richer counties because they have helped to equalize the educational opportunities in the other counties.

I know the objection could very well be raised that in that case at least those units were within the same State and did not cross State lines. I admit the force of that argument, except for the fact that the migration of our boys and girls to other States after they grow up more or less serves to erase State lines, because we have no limitation on migration in the United States, and I am glad we do not.

Mr. President, in a great many places in these United States education has threatened to break down.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt for a moment, I wish to inquire whether he can give me some idea as to how long he intends to speak on the bill. I ask this question for the reason that there are three or four other Senators who wish to speak on the bill tonight. If we can obtain a vote on this measure by 7 o'clock, we should like to do so. On the other hand, if it is impossible to have the various speeches concluded before 7 o'clock, we shall be inclined to consider having the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, and then resume the consideration of the bill.

Of course, I certainly would like very much to have the Senate vote on the bill tonight. On the other hand, I do not want in any way to rush the Senator. However, if he will tell me approximately when he will conclude his speech, possibly we shall be able to make some announcement as to what we shall do later on this evening.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Nebraska that I have no desire to postpone a vote on this bill. I wish to have the Senate vote on the bill tonight.

Mr. President, I realize I could stand here and talk a long time on this subject, but I assure the Senator from Nebraska and other Members of the Senate that I wish to cooperate. I want to vote tonight, and I shall be very glad——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator wants to vote tonight, I should like to say to him that it was announced we would try to reach a vote by 7 o'clock. Many plans have been made, and I would ask that the Senator keep that in mind, if he will.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I want to vote by 7 o'clock, and I am quitting right now.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope we may pass the bill by 7 o'clock.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, about a year ago a Pittsburgh man sent to Members of Congress an open letter in which he said he had just paid his Federal income taxes and noticed with astonishment the fact that the taxes were 37 times as great as all his taxes paid to the local subdivisions of government. He said that, for one thirty-seventh of the amount of the Federal taxes, he paid for such important services to himself and family as the education of his children, police, fire, and sanitary protection, and all the other services furnished by the local subdivisions of government, city, county, and State. He made this comment, Mr. President:

> Unless we have embarked openly on a policy of confiscation of property of the citizens, Federal taxes must be reduced until they are in line with other taxes.

I do not think we should be surprised that this taxpayer was astonished at what he found the condition to be, when we consider the increase in the Federal debt and the increase in the Federal pay roll for the past 15 years. Since I have had the honor of being a Member of this body I have noticed that Congress is under constant pressure to increase and extend the scope and character of services rendered by the Federal Government. New avenues of spending are being opened up. Almost every day bills are thrown into the hopper for this purpose. The effect of everyone of them, if enacted into law, would be to make the Federal Government bigger and cost the taxpayers more money.

For my part, I am convinced that the only way out of the difficulties in which we find ourselves is to reverse the trend and return to the principle under which America grew great and strong, the principle of local self-government.

I aline myself with those who feel that our best hope of preserving American democracy lies in preserving the independence and sovereignty of the States.

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

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Would the trend of which the Senator speaks, in his judgment, have anything to do with the obvious lack of venture capital, about which complaint has been made by the head of the New York Stock Exchange, who formerly held a very responsible position in the Government? He stated that, due to taxes and increases in wages, we have reached a point where it was impossible for a person to keep money available for venture capital investment. Would this trend have anything to do with that?

Mr. KEM. I think, Mr. President, it has a great deal to do with it. I think if we are going to preserve the American free-enterprise system we must lighten the present burden of Federal taxation; if the States want to remain independent and sovereign, they must perform the functions that fall within their sphere. Education is one of those functions. From the beginning of our Government, education has been regarded as a State, local, and private concern. Federal control of education, which inevitably would develop from Federal support, would in my judgment be hostile to the best interests of education in a democratic government. I am familiar of course with the provisions in the pending bill which disclaim any present intention to control or regulate what is taught and how it is to be taught. I also know that amendments have been proposed at this very session of Congress by able and distinguished Senators, the purpose and intent of which was in effect to regulate what should be taught and how it should be taught. I have in mind, for instance, the amendment offered by my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri, which would forbid federally aided teaching being conducted along sectarian lines, and the amendment offered by the senior Senator from New Jersey, which would require instruction in the theory and principles of the Constitution. The bill, Mr. President, in my opinion presents an opportunity for the camel to put his nose under the tent. We all recall the poem of our childhood:

> "My nose is cold," he meekly cried;
> "Oh, let me warm it by thy side!"

And then:

> The long and scraggy neck came next;
> And then, as falls the threatening storm,
> In leaped the whole ungainly form.

I am told that the proponents have not been particularly interested in the amount appropriated in the pending bill.

Mr. President, should this bill be passed, I think it would not require prophetic vision to foresee the day when bureaucrats sitting in Washington would set up so-called standards or safeguards to be met or satisfied by the States in order to qualify for Federal aid, and when, by means of such safeguards and standards, the Washington bureaucrats would determine what shall be taught, how it shall be taught, and by whom.

Then, Mr. President, as the next step, we may see in the United States—God forbid!—a ministry of education and propaganda, from its headquarters in Washington, guiding the thinking of the American people in accordance

with the political ideas of the party then in power.

The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. The fever chart of liberty is a record of resistance, not of supine submission.

We are on warning to withstand all beginnings of encroachment. "For the saddest epitaph," said Mr. Justice Sutherland, "which can be carved in memory of a vanished liberty is that it was lost because its possessors failed to stretch forth a saving hand while yet there was time."

There is yet time, Mr. President. I hope the Senate will stretch forth a saving hand.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the closing minutes of the debate, I want to make two or three very brief points. First, I want to pay my very sincere and enthusiastic compliments to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for the generalship and the statesmanship he has displayed in managing this bill. I know something about the problems which confronted the Senator from Ohio in his leadership on this bill, because the bill comes from the Committee of Labor and Public Welfare of which I am a member. I think he has worked out, when we consider all the problems which confronted him, a bill which contains conscionable compromises, and which, at the same time, never loses sight of the great objective upon which we are about to vote.

I think this is a historic hour, in that at long last the vote in the Senate tonight, I hope, will show we have finally caught up with Thomas Jefferson, so far as his views on the importance of education to democracy are concerned.

We cannot have a strong American democracy in this modern world, when we consider the rapidity with which great complex issues confront our American citizenry unless, as Thomas Jefferson pointed out, we have an enlightened people.

The following quotations from Thomas Jefferson, I think, clinch my point on the need for high-minimum standards of education for all the boys and girls of America wherever they live in our country if we are to maintain a sound representative government of self-governing people. Thus Jefferson stated:

> I think by far the most important bill in our whole code is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people.
>
> Establish the law for educating the common people. This it is the business of the state to effect.
>
> If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be.
>
> Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppression will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day.

There are great regions in this country in which the educational standards are so low that without Federal aid I can see little hope of raising them to a level which will be safe for democracy. I have no intention of voting for a bill which will make the Federal Government the determiner of Federal standards but I shall vote for any fair bill which provides that the money shall be administered by the States concerned. I think S. 472 now pending before us is such a bill.

I am not the least bit moved by the fear arguments I have heard this afternoon from some of my good friends of the Senate concerning the potential dangers, the imagined future dangers which may arise in the form of Federal domination of education if we shall pass Senate bill 472. I say I am not moved by those fear arguments, because I have covered the hearings on the bill very carefully and have studied the provisions of the bill very conscientiously and fail to find a single sentence or clause in the bill which supports any of the fear arguments we have heard this afternoon. On the contrary, I think the Senator from Ohio has been very careful in the preparation of the bill and its final submission to the Senate, to see to it that any danger of Federal domination of education, so far as the bill is concerned, is removed. There certainly has not been any danger of Federal domination of education under the Smith-Hughes Act which has been functioning in this country in the field of vocational education for many years.

I want to say to some of my friends of the Senate who seem to be a little disturbed about the danger of Federal domination of education that we cannot longer avoid the fact that the establishment of some minimum standards of education all over this country are vital to keeping American democracy strong. It is just as important that the boys and girls in Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Oregon, Washington, and all other States of the South and West have a minimum standard of education made available to them as it is that the boys and girls in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Ohio, and other wealthy States of the East enjoy a high minimum standard of education.

There is, I am satisfied at the present time, general acceptance of the principle of Federal aid to the schools. The reasons in support of such aid are numerous. Thousands of American children are receiving substandard education. Indeed, according to census estimates taken in 1945 there were over 4,000,000 children between the ages of 10 and 17 who were attending no schools whatsoever.

Teachers are underpaid. I believe there are only two States which have been able to enact a $2,400 minimum salary law for new teachers, and over 50 percent of the teachers in public schools are paid under $2,000 a year. This has resulted in a lack of qualified teachers, as a consequence of which some of our schools and classes have been closed and others have been placed on a part-time basis. There exist in this country shocking educational inequalities because of the wide variance in the States' ability to support their schools.

These things furnish abundance of proof that the Federal Government must give support to the schools if we are to improve our educational system and provide throughout the country a more acceptable general educational standard for our children. There is absolutely no reason, at least no supportable reason, why a child who happens to have been born in a State where there is no great wealth should be through life handicapped by insufficient education.

The pending bill, S. 472, has been on the Senate calendar for almost a year. This bill contains provisions which give absolute safeguards that there will be no interference with State and local control of schools. Fear of such interference has been one of the primary objections to Federal aid. Indeed, there are specific prohibitions in the bill which would prevent any Federal department or employee of a Federal department from exercising supervision or control over any school or educational agency with respect to this act.

We no longer live in the kind of society where the simple rudiments of education are adequate to prepare a child for citizenship. The student of today must learn to think in terms of a highly complex world. If we are going to keep our democratic form of government strong we must add to the enlightenment of our people, and that can be done only through the educational forces of this country. Our schools are failing woefully in their obligations to the child and to the Nation unless they equip him to face world problems of today and to solve them.

S. 472 may not be the complete answer but it certainly is a partial one, and for that reason I am giving it my active support.

The next point I want to make, Mr. President, is to say that for many years in this country there have been some States principally wealthy eastern States which have been the beneficiaries of skimming off the economic cream of the great natural resources of the States of the South and West. It will be found that those beneficiary States for the most part are limited to some of the great industrial and financial States of the East. From some of those States in the East we find some of the strongest objections to the pending bill.

Many of the great industrial financial States of the East have received the raw materials and products of the natural resources of the South and West and manufactured them in the industrial plants of the East to the great economic advantage not only of the East but of the entire country. I would be the first to pay high tribute to the many industrial contributions which the manufacturing States of the East have made to American economy and to the high standard of living of the American people.

However, the fact remains that the people of the South and West are aware of the fact that the Eastern industrial States have been able to build up great wealth and financial empires as the result of the great profits which they have gained through their industrial processes of manufacturing southern and western raw materials into finished consumer goods. It is sometimes said that during the course of the development of the industrial era in America the raw material States of the South and West have served as economic colonies of the manufactur-

ing East and in no small measure have felt the effects of the exploitation of the natural resources of the South and West by the East.

Be that as it may, there can be no doubt about the fact that the sources of tax revenue are not nearly so great in the less wealthy States of the South and West as in the much more wealthy States of the East. This situation has been augmented by the fact that in many of our Southern and Western States the Federal Government owns large tracts of public lands from which no tax dollars can be collected by the State. This public domain serves all the people of the country including the residents of the Eastern States. The loss of State revenue from the public domain owned by the Federal Government is one of the reasons which has made it difficult for many States to maintain those minimum standards of education in their school system essential to educating an enlightened citizenry.

Therefore in view of the many economic benefits which the people of the East have received and are receiving from the natural resources of the South and the West I submit that it is not a sound argument for representatives of the Eastern States to argue in the Halls of Congress that it is unfair to raise revenue from Federal taxes in Eastern States to be used in a Federal-aid program for education throughout the Nation.

It is my view that there are few problems which come before us charged with a greater national public interest than is the need for providing decent educational advantages and facilities for all the children of America.

In my opinion the bill pending before us contains a financial formula for working out the specific amounts which shall be made available to the various States which is as fair, reasonable, and workable a formula as can be agreed upon in view of the surrounding facts and circumstances which have produced this bill.

I want to point out to some of the Senators who come from very wealthy Eastern States that when there is poor education in any State in the country, the boys and girls do not necessarily stay in those States. Under modern transportation conditions, and with the rapid shifts of population, the educational standards in States in the South and West are of vital concern to Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and other wealthy States of the East.

There is another point I want to mention in connection with the many problems which confronted the Senator from Ohio in preparing this bill. The Senator has been confronted with opposition from some of the leaders of the private-school systems of this country. Senate bill 472 does not discriminate against the private-school systems of the country, in the sense that it denies them any financial benefits from the Federal Government, provided the States in which the private schools are located, within their constitutional power, provide from State funds certain educational benefits to the children of private schools. I want to say to the private-school leaders in the country that I recognize the public function they perform in public education in this country. The Members of Congress and the people of the country, including those who are opposed to any benefits going to children attending private schools, can best test whether the private schools of America are performing a public function by reflecting for a moment on this hypothetical case.

Suppose tonight every private school in America should be closed, and tomorrow morning the students of those schools should go to the doors of the public schools and ask for admittance. Would there then be imposed upon the taxpayers of America an additional tax burden? There is no question about it. It would amount to many millions of dollars.

So I say to my friends who are opposed to any benefits going to children attending private schools that in due course of time I think the American people will recognize the fact that our private schools, through their educational programs, are in fact performing also a public educational service. Hence, within the Constitution and in keeping with the doctrine of separation of church and state, I, for one, feel that private schools are performing public services which entitle the children in private schools to some Federal-aid benefits.

Frankly, I do not know what kind of a compromise can be worked out in regard to giving aid to the child who attends a private school. For the superior child I suppose a scholarship could be worked out. However, I do not agree that it is not proper to provide students in the private schools with hot-lunch programs, transportation or textbooks. I think that to say that supplying Federal aid for such services only results in the private school being able then to use its own money for other purposes is stretching the point a bit. I say that because I think those who so argue are overlooking the fact that the strictly educational functions performed by private schools involve a great public service.

As I just said suppose that tomorrow we should close every private school in the United States and throw all of the burden of the educational functions now performed by those schools upon our public schools. If that were done then I think the taxpayers of the country would have a better appreciation of the public service in education which private schools are now performing and at a considerable saving to the taxpayer. Thus I say that there is a conscionable area for compromise on this issue if we limit any aid to providing the individual child certain benefits which all American children should receive no matter what school they attend.

Take, for example, the bus situation. Walk out onto any side street in the morning when the youngsters are going to school and see the youngsters that go to public schools climb into a public bus and see the youngsters that go to private schools passed up by that bus and required to walk to school or seek some other form of transportation. They are walking to school on the same street on which the bus moves and that same street is built and maintained by the taxpayers' dollar. Granted that my example is an extreme one, I use it only to show that this whole problem is one of degree rather than one of immutable principle.

I have not reached any final conclusion in regard to what should be done about the problem because I am trying to find some reasonable solution to the question. However, I do not agree with those who argue that no Federal funds should be used to support private schools in any way, shape, or form if by that they mean that no Federal funds should be used for the benefit of the individual child who may be going to the private school. He, too, is going to be a citizen of this democracy, and I want him to be a good citizen. To the extent that a good education will help him to be a good citizen, I want him to have the benefit of that Federal aid which the Supreme Court may find can be granted him under our Constitution.

To a very large extent this question of Federal aid to children attending private schools involves still to be answered questions of constitutional law both in the respective States of the country and under the Federal Constitution as well. Under S. 472 we very wisely have not attempted to go too far into this particular phase of constitutional law. We have not done so because we think it important to establish in the statute law of this country a principle of Federal aid to education and do it by way of a statute about which there can be no serious question as to its constitutionality. I think S. 472 is such a statute.

In my opinion the leaders of private school education in this country are unwise in raising such vigorous opposition to S. 472 because I think they should first be willing to see established in the Federal statutes congressional approval of the principle of Federal aid to education.

I think they have been unwise in the second place in raising such strenuous opposition to S. 472 because the bill does not close the door to future Federal aid to children attending private schools to the extent that such may be possible within the terms of our Federal Constitution. It is true that S. 472 does not provide direct Federal aid to children in private schools but it does authorize the use of Federal aid funds for the benefit of children attending private schools to whatever degree a given State provides specific services under State law to children attending private schools. Thus paragraph (B), section 6 of the bill reads as follows:

(B) No provision of this act shall be construed to delimit a State in its definition of its program of public education: *Provided*, That the funds paid to a State under this act shall be expended only by public agencies and under public control, except that in any State in which funds derived from State or local revenues are disbursed to nonpublic educational institutions for expenditure for any of the purposes for which funds paid to such State under this act may be expended, funds so paid to such State may be disbursed to and expended by such institutions for such purposes; but the amounts disbursed

during any fiscal year to any such institution from funds paid to a State under this act shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount disbursed to such institution during such fiscal year from funds derived from State or local revenues as the aggregate of amounts disbursed by such State during such fiscal year from funds paid to such State under this act bears to the aggregate of amounts expended during such fiscal year for current expenditures (excluding interest, debt service, and capital outlay) for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education in such State from funds derived from State and local revenues.

I fully appreciate that this particular provision is not satisfactory to those private school leaders who want to have included in this first bill on Federal aid to education, which has a good chance of being passed by the Congress, a specific provision which would place children attending private schools on the same footing, as far as Federal aid is concerned, as children attending public schools. However, it should be said frankly that political realities made the inclusion of any such provision the death warrant for the bill itself. There are too many problems still to be solved in connection with the constitutional legal implications of such a proposal to justify jeopardizing the Federal aid principle for education which we seek to establish in Federal law by passage of this bill.

I completely agree with the position taken by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare when in its report on this bill it had the following to say about section 6 in dealing with the availability of appropriations:

Section 6: Defines the objects for which Federal funds may be expended under the act. An expenditure in any given State, to be a proper expenditure of Federal funds under the act, must be (a) for an elementary- or secondary-school purpose, (b) a current expenditure for such purpose, and (c) an expenditure for which non-Federal educational funds may legally and constitutionally be expended in that State.

Variations in State finance systems is recognized in the section. Disbursements may be made directly by State educational authorities as is done in some States, through local public-school jurisdictions as is customary, or through other State public-education agencies. Non-public-school children may in any State receive benefits of the act to the extent that expenditures relating thereto meet the foregoing conditions; that is, the expenditures must be current expenditures for elementary- or secondary-school purposes, and they must be only for such objects of elementary- or secondary-school current expenditure from non-Federal educational funds in that State.

With respect to this section, the committee has examined extensive materials bearing upon the question of aid to nonpublic schools. The committee considered bills which would make Federal funds available to such schools regardless of the policy of any State government in refusing in any way to recognize such schools as part of the public-school system. There are many who argue in support of this position. There are others who hold that Federal funds should not be available for nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, even though made eligible by State governments to receive the benefits of State and local revenues. If the Congress were to yield to either of these arguments, it would clearly be changing the educational policy of the State and thus the principle of State and local control which we accept as basic to this legislation.

The difficulty has to do chiefly with those nonpublic, nontax-supported institutions which are sectarian. The committee has looked into the question of the constitutionality of direct financial assistance to sectarian schools. While there is no doubt in the minds of the committee regarding the constitutionality of use of Federal funds for the support of public schools under public control, it is equally certain that direct payments of public funds of all types to private sectarian schools is unconstitutional. In the words of the Supreme Court:

"No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."

Courts have upheld practices of States providing children in sectarian schools, through public taxation, certain services auxiliary to education, such as free textbooks and transportation. These decisions have been based on the theory of benefit to the child, not benefit to the school. The most recent example is a decision of the Supreme Court which ruled that a statute in New Jersey authorizing reimbursement to parents for transportation of children attending parochial schools did not violate the Federal Constitution. The decision was based upon the theory that the statute was for a public purpose and not for support of the private school. According to this opinion—

"This Court has said that parents may, in the discharge of their duty under State compulsory education laws, send their children to a religious rather than a public school if the school meets the secular educational requirements which the State has power to impose. See *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters* (268 U. S. 510). It appears that these parochial schools meet New Jersey's requirements. The State contributes no money to the schools. It does not support them. Its legislation, as applied, does no more than provide a general program to help parents get their children, regardless of their religion, safely and expeditiously to and from accredited schools.

"The first amendment has erected a wall between church and state. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach. New Jersey has not breached it here."

This provision is not limited to the question of support of nonpublic schools. Many types of educational services are recognized as a part of tax-supported free public elementary and secondary education in some States and not in others. Not all States, for example, have generally established kindergartens. In some States the elementary and secondary school program includes only 11 years. In other States public tax-supported education under local control includes the thirteenth and fourteenth years.

It is natural that the character of education under our decentralized system differs in type and quality from State to State and community to community. Experiments in method have been freely made and have failed or succeeded after a fair trial. The people of States and localities are continuously changing, adapting, or extending their educational programs as so to provide improved educational services for children and youth. Men differently taught have developed novel and clashing theories which have finally met in the form of national debate to be passed upon by the entire people, as they should be in a free republic. This very variety of education has promoted a freedom of thought and, consequently, a material progress, greater than that of any other country in the world.

It is the intent of this section to supplement the prohibitions of section 2 in leaving a broad mandate to the States to continue exercising responsibility for determining the character of public-supported educational programs and the means by which it is to be achieved. It is not intended as an invitation to introduce practices which would breach provisions of the Constitution or which would otherwise violate the will of the people in any State as expressed through their legislatures and courts.

There is one other point I wish to make, and I shall close. I want the RECORD to show that in trying to strike the balance which I think we shall have to strike in future legislation, in seeing to it that the child in the private school, and not the private school itself, receives any benefits from any Federal-aid funds, we must comply strictly to the constitutional doctrine laid down by our Supreme Court. This will call for the highest type of statesmanship on our part in order to make it perfectly clear to all concerned that we do not intend to cross the constitutional line of separation of church and state.

However, during the course of this debate I think some of my friends who have argued against S. 472 on constitutional grounds have been following a static concept of the Constitution. To me the Constitution's great strength in preserving representative government through a written constitution is to be found in the fact that it is a dynamic and not a static document. Its dynamics permit of its flexible adjustment to changing social, economic, and political problems as they develop from decade to decade in America.

However, I do not mean to imply that political demand for Federal aid to private schools can ever justify setting aside through a loose interpretation of the Constitution the separation of church and state doctrine.

At the same time we must recognize that every American boy and girl, be he in attendance at a public school or at a private school, is training for American citizenship, and it is to the interest of all our people to see to it that he has afforded to him minimum educational standards which will help develop him into the highest type of citizenship.

Because I think that Senate bill 472 is a bill which represents fair compromises, and is a bill which is sound in principle I am pleased to support it with my vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a letter in opposition to S. 472, sent to me by one of the outstanding Catholic leaders of the country, the Most Reverend Francis P. Keough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

EXHIBIT A

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have the honor to address you concerning S. 472, a bill for Federal aid to education, as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. On behalf of the Department of Education, National Catholic Welfare Conference, I wish to express objection to S. 472 in its present form.

In the first place, our objection is concerned with the bill's failure to confine Federal aid only to those States in need of

Federal funds for their schools. As you know, S. 472 authorizes Federal aid to every State, including, therefore, those States not in need of Federal assistance to maintain an adequate school system. Although the bill now authorizes only $5 per child for the 26 States which actually have sufficient State and local resources to finance their own schools, one may anticipate that once the pattern of Federal aid for every State is established, States and local communities will try to shift an ever-increasing amount of their financial burden for education to the Federal Government.

In view of the tremendous demands now being made upon the Federal Government for international purposes it would seem most unwise for the Congress to enact a bill granting $5 for every school child in the State of Delaware which certainly needs no help from the Federal Government to maintain its expensive public-school system. The same might be said of many other wealthy States. It is our opinion, therefore, that enactment of S. 472 in its present form will set a dangerous precedent in educational finance, one which might lead to unwarranted Federal interference with the Nation's schools.

Secondly, our objection is concerned with the discrimination against non-public-school children permitted by S. 472 in its present form. In one section of the bill the formula for allocating funds to the States "counts in" all children (ages 5–17), including those in nonpublic schools, as beneficiaries of Federal aid; in another section the bill permits the States "to count out" non-public-school children for whom Federal funds presumably were appropriated. Is it not fair to say that a bill is discriminatory if it "counts in" children in one section and "counts them out" in another?

Perhaps an example will illustrate the previous point. Ohio has about 1,400,000 children between the ages of 5 and 17. Of this number about 157,000 are enrolled in Catholic parochial schools. Under the bill's formula for allocating funds, Ohio would receive $5 for every one of the 157,000 parochial school children—a total of $785,000. Yet the bill has no requirement whatsoever that Ohio spend one penny of this amount for the direct or indirect aid of these parochial school children. This is an unfair method of distributing Federal funds appropriated for the educational welfare of all children.

This discrimination cannot be discounted by appealing to State's rights. Respect for State's rights does not mean that a Federal law must give any State the right to discriminate or not discriminate against non-public-school children.

I shall be most grateful for your kind consideration of this important issue.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS P. KEOUGH,
Episcopal Chairman.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish very briefly to express my approval of the principles involved in the measure before the Senate. I shall not enter into any detailed discussion of the bill, because that is not necessary. I would not even take as much as 5 minutes, which I hope will be the limit of my remarks, to speak about the bill, except for the fact that 2 or 3 years ago, when a similar measure was before the Senate, I did everything within my power to secure its adoption by the Senate, but under the conditions which then existed the Senate voted to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor, and it has not been before the Senate from that time until this.

I am not disturbed, Mr. President, by the fears which seem to actuate some Members of the Senate, and others, that the adoption of this measure, providing Federal aid to education, will break down State lines or seriously interfere with the jurisdiction of the States in the control of their educational systems. Nor do I entertain any fear that the adoption of such a measure will in any way, directly or remotely, bring into question the problem of the separation of church and state. It is difficult to draw a straight line anywhere in considering our duties to our States and to our church, whatever that church may be, and say that all on one side belongs to the State and all on the other belongs to the church. Our duties as citizens of this country, moral and political, economic and social, cross this line intermittently at frequent intervals, so that it is utterly impossible to draw a fine-spun, hair-splitting distinction between our duties as citizens of this great Republic and our duties as Christians in this great Republic.

I am not disturbed by any of these compunctions, because I think that all of us, without regard to our political affiliations or our geographic locations, do the best we can, in public and in private life, to work out these problems, to solve them in a manner which will best militate in behalf of the welfare of the country now and in the future.

Likewise I do not entertain any fears that the adoption of this measure will in any way impinge upon the right of the States to control their educational systems. We are a nation. In war and in peace we think as a nation. We fight as a nation if we are compelled to fight. Our ambitions and our aspirations for peace and accord among the nations of the world have a national basis, without regard to artificial boundary lines drawn geographically which separate us in certain matters from the communities next door. We cannot otherwise be a great nation except as a united nation.

We know that whatever lowers the standard of life in any part of our country lowers it everywhere. Whatever breaks down the standard of our citizenship in the remotest section of the United States lowers it for the country as a whole. Therefore it is our object as a Nation, no less than it is an object of the individual States, to elevate, as far as we may, the intellectual conceptions of our people, their qualifications to exercise the divine life of self-government wherever they may live. We recognize that their ability to exercise that right wisely and intelligently is enhanced by their comprehension of the problems which face this country. Therefore, education, intellectual training, the ability to discriminate between the many issues which arise from time to time, the ability to separate the genuine from the spurious, must be a matter of training, as well as experience. Therefore the pending bill is intended to strengthen our ability as a Nation to comprehend and assess the values upon which the people must pass from time to time, regardless of their occupation.

Some 2 or 3 years ago a similar bill was before the Senate. I advocated its passage at that time, and did everything I could within my power to secure its adoption. It was recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor, as I have already indicated, and it may be that the bill before the Senate now is a better bill than the one before it on the previous occasion. Our experience and our study of the problem have undoubtedly whetted our appetites for perfection, so far as we are capable of it, and I am glad to support the bill without any compunctions, without any reservations.

I have voted against most of the amendments which have been offered to the bill because I felt that the committee which reported the bill had considered all these problems and weighed the arguments for and against all the efforts to make a change, and had reached a wise conclusion.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am glad to support the bill. I hope it will be overwhelmingly adopted in the Senate, and that the House of Representatives will pass it, and that we may embark this great Nation of ours upon a program of enlightenment and education, so that whether any particular State or any particular community needs it or not, it may be available for those States and those communities which do need it, in order that we may gradually elevate the standards of our citizenship and our capacity of self-government and democracy, which, while not the ultimate goal of the American people, is the means of attaining the ultimate goal. I am happy to support the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question now recurs on its final passage.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. TAFT and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. OVERTON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with

the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] who is unavoidably detained, is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. The Senator from New Hampshire is detained on official committee business, and the Senator from Nebraska is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea", and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—58

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Brooks	Hoey	Revercomb
Cain	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Capehart	Ives	Russell
Capper	Jenner	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cordon	Kilgore	Stennis
Downey	Knowland	Stewart
Dworshak	Langer	Taft
Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McCarran	Thye
Ferguson	McClellan	Umstead
Flanders	McFarland	Vandenberg
Fulbright	McKellar	Watkins
George	McMahon	Wiley
Green	Maybank	
Hatch	Morse	

NAYS—22

Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Bricker	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Lodge	Wherry
Byrd	McCarthy	Williams
Connally	Malone	Wilson
Donnell	Millikin	Young
Ecton	Moore	
Gurney	O'Conor	

NOT VOTING—16

Brewster	Martin	Tobey
Bridges	Murray	Tydings
Bushfield	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Butler	Overton	White
McGrath	Taylor	
Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.	

So the bill S. 472 was passed.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 986)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the minority members of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Florida, and Representatives JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, and AUGUSTINE KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, have made a careful study of the first 6 months of experience under the Labor-Management Relations Act, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley law, and of the report made public by the committee on March 15, 1948.

We offer this report of the minority on the important subject of labor-management relations, knowing that the record under the new law is being carefully appraised by a wide segment of the American people. We have made this study with that care and impartiality warranted by the importance of the subject. It is submitted to the Congress and to the people of the United States in a sincere desire to acquaint them with the operation of the law, so that it may be better understood.

We are particularly indebted to the Public Affairs Institute, a scientific research organization, for the factual data which it has made available to us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the minority views will be received and printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair) 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 A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

COMPENSATION TO VETERANS TRAINING ON THE JOB—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MORSE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1393) to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, 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 inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'6. While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part, (including an institutional on-farm training course) such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding thirty days in a calendar year: Except, That (1) while so enrolled and pursuing a course of full-time institutional training, such person, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $75 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $105 per month if he has one dependent or $120 per month if he has more than one dependent, and (2) while so enrolled and pursuing a course of part-time institutional training, including a course of institutional on-farm training, or other combination course, such person shall be paid, subject to the limitations of this paragraph, additional subsistence allowance in an amount bearing the same relation to the difference between the basic rates and the increased rates provided in (1) hereof as the institutional training part of such course bears to a course of full-time institutional training. Such person attending a course on a part-time basis, and such person receiving compensation for productive labor whether performed as part of his apprentice or other training on the job at institutions, business or other establishments, or otherwise, shall be entitled to receive such lesser sums, if any, as subsistence or dependency allowances as may be determined by the Administrator: *Provided*, That in no event shall the rate of such allowance plus the compensation received exceed $210 per month for a veteran without a dependent, or $270 per month for a veteran with one dependent, or $290 for a veteran with two or more dependents: *Provided further*, That only so much of the compensation as is derived from productive labor based on the standard workweek for the particular trade or industry, exclusive of overtime, shall be considered in computing the rate of allowances payable under this paragraph.'

"SEC. 2. So much of paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, as precedes the first proviso, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'3. While pursuing training prescribed herein and for two months after his employability is determined, each veteran pursuing a course under this part, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents: Except, That (1) each veteran pursuing a course of full-time institutional training under this part shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $75 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $105 per month, if he has one dependent, or $120 per month, if he has more than one dependent, and (2) each veteran enrolled in and pursuing a course of institutional on-farm training or other combination course, under this part shall be paid, subject to the limitations of this paragraph, additional subsistence allowance in an amount bearing the same relation to the difference between the basic rates and the increased rates provided in (1) hereof as the institutional training

part of such course bears to a course of full-time institutional training.'

"SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect on the first day of April, 1948."

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 with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "An Act to provide additional subsistence allowances and to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances pertaining to certain veterans"; and the House agree to the same.

WAYNE MORSE,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
LISTER HILL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
J. E. RANKIN,
W. M. WHEELER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the conference report on Senate bill 1393, the so-called veterans' allowance bill, be made the unfinished business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow the Senator from Illinois be recognized, in order that I may make a 40-minute speech upon the foreign policy of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, far be it from me to object to the unanimous-consent request. However, I am wondering, because the conference report was to be expedited, if possible, at that time, if the Senator from Oregon objects to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President. I think the Chair will recall that I asked unanimous consent to have the conference report made the unfinished business, and to proceed with it tomorrow noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the unfinished business, by unanimous consent.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Illinois that I do not think the conference report will require very long. However, in fairness to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] it should be pointed out that the reason we are presenting the conference report at 12 o'clock tomorrow is that the Senator from Ohio must leave the city at 1:30. I think it is only fair to say that there will be objections. We want to be heard in argument. If the objections are sustained by the Chair, the junior Senator from Oregon proposes to appeal from the decision of the Chair and argue the point. The conference report has already been agreed to by the House, and I think we should dispose of it tomorrow favorably.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the able Senator from Oregon, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized by the Chair immediately following the disposition of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. OVERTON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, by the time the Senator from Oregon gets through, if the tax-bill veto comes to the House and is disposed of as quickly as is expected, we may have the tax-bill veto here, and I do not think we ought to agree to a unanimous-consent request to put something ahead of the consideration of that question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I feel that inasmuch as the request was made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who is the whip on the other side, we should assure him that after the tax-bill veto is disposed of he will be recognized, and possibly before.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or if the tax-bill veto is not here, the Senator may be recognized after the disposition of the conference report.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has the floor. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. WHERRY. First I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, am I to understand that we have been told that a veto message in connection with the tax bill is coming here tomorrow? Is that known for a certainty?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator addressing that inquiry to the Chair?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The answer is that the Chair does not know.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think I can assure the Senate that the veto message on the tax bill will be here tomorrow. It must first go to the House. It will probably be acted upon immediately upon the convening of the House. I understand that the House is to vote upon it without debate. It ought to be here as soon as a roll call on the veto can be had in the House.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as objection has been made to the unanimous-consent request, I am glad to yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I make the further unanimous-consent request that after the conference report which was detailed by the able Senator from Oregon is acted upon and after the veto message from the President is considered, I be recognized at that time to make a speech on the foreign policy of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield now to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I was going to lodge an objection to the request; but since objection has already been made, I do not request recognition at this time.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, Friday, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 2, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

William Marvel, of Delaware, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware, vice John J. Morris, Jr., term expired.

John B. Tansil, of Montana, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana. (Mr. Tansil is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Paul B. Messick, of Delaware, to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware. (Mr. Messick is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.)

Frank Golden, of Nebraska, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska, vice George E. Proudfit, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, AO15355, Air Force of the United States (major general, U. S. Air Force), for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with rank of general, for the period of 4 years beginning from date of appointment, under the provisions of section 208 of the National Security Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be first lieutenants

William Ross Reed, O50328.
Lowell Russell Hutson, O38419.
Thomas Arnot Mort, O50330.
Roger Stanley Walden, O41320.
John Hyatt Newell, O38420.
Eric Otto Alfred Miller, Jr., A50342.
Harry Theodore Pierson, Jr., O50343.
Edward Paul Crovo, O38430.
Owen Joseph Walsh, O50345.
Kenneth Peter Fischer, O39471.
Otto William Huebner, O50346.
Jere Hill Dement, O50347.
John Maurice Barnard, O56483.
Erwin Risley Brigham, O38438.
Eames Langden Yates, O50350.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Roger Lee Cramer, O38574.
Robert Eugene Van Der Aa, O38575.
Robert Levi Covington, O38576.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947:

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Jeraldine Frances Skidmore, N797.
Mary Ellen Williams, N1168.
Mary Frances Imilda Haley, N796.
Kathryn Ione Dixon, N961.
Mary Catherine Proctor, N1169.
Helen Grace Kurutz, N1170.
Jessie Melnik, N962.
Dorothy Jones, N798.
Nancy Leigh Limb, N799.
Mary Ann V. Hartnett, N963.
Christine Elizabeth Reinsch, N1172.
Julia Choate, N800.
Lila Geneva Van Scoyk, N1173.
Mary Agnes Azzalino, N801.
Elizabeth Annerita LaRoche, N802.
Mary Ethel Doyal, N1174.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

John Taylor Lewis O7000.
George Price Hays O7149.

To be brigadier generals

William Lynn Roberts O3597.
Vernon Edwin Prichard O3882.
Paul Vincent Kane O4452.
Julian Wallace Cunningham O4922.
Rex Webb Beasley O5246.
John Lloyd McKee O5613.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS AND THE WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be captains

Genevieve S. Beard, WMSC (PT), M2215.
Leona F. Koch, WMSC (Diet.), R884.
Dot Miller, WMSC (Diet.), R2212.
Jessie L. Miller, WMSC (PT), M2111.
Elizabeth M. Nevels, WMSC (Diet.), R2209.
Margaret Stuart, WMSC (Diet.), R537.

To be first lieutenants

Agnes Bacior, ANC, N737362.
Ethel L. Barnes, WMSC (Diet.), R999.
Geraldine B. Bernard, ANC, N753081.
Edith J. Bonnet, ANC, N788513.
Faith Boyd, ANC, N721777.
Faunetta L. Brown, ANC, N727101.
Ann C. Browning, ANC, N762686.
Martha Carle, ANC, N725819.
Corinne Casey, ANC, N764298.
Mary A. Casserly, ANC, N722914.
Katherine E. Chickering, ANC, N720896.
Louise M. Coard, ANC, N742037.
Irene M. Connell, ANC, N757627.
Gladys R. Corey, ANC, N761393.
Dorcas E. Coulter, ANC, N755160.
Edna F. Crandall, ANC, N797540.
Paula B. Crowe, ANC, N727421.
Kathleen M. Dean, ANC, N757103.
Glenice H. Dearborn, ANC, N753327.
Ada W. Desprez, ANC, N767585.
Rachel E. Dillemuth, ANC, N725408.
Irene M. Donahue, ANC, N753537.
Pauline K. Driscoll, ANC, N732846.
Ruby I. Easter, ANC, N763533.
Nellie I. Feagans, ANC, N725473.
Virginia M. Gillespie, ANC, N745399.
Thelma R. Glover, ANC, N788312.
Alyce D. Gordon, ANC, N793629.
Orpha L. Grimsrud, ANC, N773989.
Irene I. Guenther, ANC, N775644.
Corinne R. Hauck, ANC, N755466.
Mildred J. Hillhouse, ANC, N774678.
Marynell A. Hoefs, ANC, N735073.
Betty J. Hughes, ANC, N731300.
Dorothy J. Hund, ANC, N775948.
Jane V. Isler, ANC, N723368.
Olah Jones, ANC, N795632.
Angie C. Kammeraad, ANC, N731238.
Elizabeth E. King, ANC, N726050.
Julia E. Koszalka, ANC, N724630.
Jean B. Koziol, ANC, N758909.
Rose Kudletz, ANC, N801068.
Ruth R. Kuhlmann, ANC, N775178.
Dorothy E. Kwiatkowski, ANC, N793382.
Mildred D. Lang, ANC, N729246.
Hester M. Logar, ANC, N759736.
Louise M. Malone, ANC, N728197.
Agnes McMahon, ANC, N754840.
Margaret M. McManus, ANC, N760419.
Marian R. McQuiston, ANC, N724987.
Mary A. Michelitch, ANC, N762272.
Irene E. Miller, ANC, N731182.
Ruth T. Mills, ANC, N796495.
Dorothy E. Mooneyham, ANC, N787360.
Dorothy B. Morgan, ANC, N778638.
Mary A. Mulholland, ANC, N769883.
Anne M. Murphy, ANC, N787887.
Gladys M. Nash, ANC, N734451.
Sarah L. Neal, ANC, N787755.
Anne L. Nodziak, ANC, N759749.
Alma M. Nyberg, ANC, N720757.
Ree S. Oler, ANC, N779590.
Mary E. Pilchard, ANC, N728832.
Olivette C. Plante, ANC, N721036.
Ann C. Polchak, ANC, N723095.
Julia R. Pollack, ANC, N755882.
Julianne M. Rheaume, ANC, N722736.
Emily M. Rickey, ANC, N762850.
Mabel L. Rime, ANC, N730455.
Ruth M. Robinson, ANC, N730523.
Margaret K. Rucker, ANC, N759826.
Lucile A. Seaman, ANC, N731657.
Eugenia M. Sieve, ANC, N768668.
Carolyn E. Smith, WMSC (Diet.) R1064.
Frances A. Soule, ANC, N797596.
Agatha B. Spaeth, ANC, N779492.
Margaret C. Stafford, ANC, N771471.
Valeska B. Staudt, ANC, N788882.
Annie B. Stewart, ANC, N764389.
Nellie T. Tamalonis, ANC, N796403.
Martha J. Taranta, ANC, N722782.
Lois L. Turnbull, ANC, N732395.
Maude C. Vertrees, ANC, N787411.
M. Eloise Watkins, ANC, N725272.
Marcella Wenderott, ANC, N783472.
Louise A. Whalen, ANC, N759373.
Juanita H. Williams, ANC, N734896.
Eileen A. Wittman, ANC, N758820.
Mary G. Young, ANC, N743936.
Nellie J. Zalesney, ANC, N787775.

To be second lieutenants

Ethlyn S. Altmann, ANC, N793948.
Margaret E. Burk, ANC, N792040.
Odessa A. Falls, ANC, N769510.
Helen J. Fitzgerald, ANC, N792063.
Marilyn A. Goeltz, ANC, N792041.
Alma E. Guinn, ANC, N792042.
Pearl I. Jank, ANC, N792058.
Phyllis I. Morrow, ANC, N792052.
Della I. Murphy, ANC, N780358.
Nancy B. Power, ANC, N765872.
Katherine W. Schumacher, ANC, N786881.
Jean E. Thompson, ANC, N795665.
Signe Trangsrud, ANC, N797818.
Betty J. Walls, ANC, N778728.
Marian Waterhouse, ANC, N754612.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion. (The date of rank for these officers will be the date of appointment.)

To be colonels

×Early Edward Walters Duncan, AO7588.
Wallace William Millard, AO7613.
George Luke Usher, AO8050.
Joseph Henry Davidson, AO8098.
Robert Kauch, AO8345.
Douglas Johnston, AO8467.
Shiras Alexander Blair, AO8497.
×David Charles George Schlenker, AO8603.
Desmond O'Keefe, AO8621.
Hugh Whitt, AO9556.
×Ray Aloysious Dunn, AO9561.
×Frederick Foster Christine, AO8719.
John Isham Moore, AO9649.
Richard Cox Couplan, AO9792.
James Franklin Powell, AO9823.
Alonzo Maning Drake, AO9841.
Victor Herbert Strahm, AO9843.
Byron Turner Burt, Jr., AO9874.
Earle Gene Harper, AO9875.
Lotha August Smith, AO9879.
Guy Malcolm Kinman, AO9969.
Joseph Leonard Stromme, AO9998.
×Frank Denis Hackett, AO10040.
Theodore Joseph Koenig, AO10183.
Omer Osmer Niergarth, AO10207.
Hugh Gibson Culton, AO10325.
Auby Casey Strickland, AO10338.
Ulysses Grant Jones, AO10388.
Dache McClain Reeves, AO10462.
John Carroll Kennedy, AO10464.
Edmund Pendleton Gaines, AO10472.
Clayton Lawrence Bissell, AO10474.
Robert Victor Ignico, AO10491.
Clifford Cameron Nutt, AO10498.
Isaiah Davies, AO10505.
Arthur William Vanaman, AO10506.
Fred Cyrus Nelson, AO10519.
Clarence Herbert Welch, AO10571.
George Godfrey Lundberg, AO10579.
Bayard Johnson, AO10657.
Frank Martyn Paul, AO10586.
Phillips Melville, AO10696.
×John Gordon Williams, AO10697.
Albert Brown Pitts, AO10703.
Robert Duane Knapp, AO10707.
William Bettencourt Souza, AO10719.
Joseph Alexis Wilson, AO10723.
Charles Yawkey Banfill, AO10733.
Walter Raymond Peck, AO10768.
Emil Charles Kiel, AO10787.
Charles Hale Dowman, AO10805.
Thomas Welch Blackburn, AO10814.
Harry Anton Johnson, AO10825.
Max Frank Schneider, AO10840.
Bernard Tobias Castor, AO10897.
Edgar Eugene Glenn, AO10914.
Cortlandt Spencer Johnson, AO10922.
Charles Wesley Sullivan, AO10946.
Neal Dow Franklin, AO10959.
Melvin B. Asp, AO10971.
Malcolm Nebeker Stewart, AO10982.
Newton Longfellow, AO10995.
Wendell Brown McCoy, AO11009.
Martinus Stenseth, AO11014.
James Atwater Woodruff, AO11041.
Arthur Ignatius Ennis, AO11051.
John Frederick Whiteley, AO11099.
Guy Lewis McNeil, AO11103.
Clarence Prescott Talbot, AO11112.
Robert Theodore Zane, AO11159.
Lucas Victor Beau, AO11175.
James Milligan Gillespie, AO11186.
David Robert Stinson, AO11266.
Joseph Theodore Morris, AO11267.
George Allan McHenry, AO11279.
Paul Hyde Prentiss, AO11299.
Warren Arthur Maxwell, AO11303.
Paul Edmund Burrows, AO11331.
John Vernon Hart, AO11367.
Donald David Fitzgerald, AO11393.
Austin Walrath Martenstein, AO11399.
Levi L. Beery, AO11410.
Warren Rice Carter, AO11425.
Harold Alling McGinnis, AO11443.
Morton Howard McKinnon, AO11446.
George Hendricks Beverley, AO11455.
Wallace Gordon Smith, AO11471.
Charles Adam Horn, AO11473.
Byron Elihu Gates, AO11476.
Emile Tisdale Kennedy, AO11498.
George William Goddard, AO11514.
Thomas Herbert Chapman, AO11520.
Angier Hobbs Foster, AO11528.
Clarence Edgar Crumrine, AO11599.
John Ross Morgan, AO11611.
Charles Edwin Thomas, Jr., AO11615.
James Bumer Jordan, AO11624.
×Jack Clemens Hodgson, AO11668.
Stanton Thomas Smith, AO11796.
Joseph Popenjoy Bailey, AO11844.
Pardoe Martin, AO11890.
Charles Backes, AO11968.
Sigmund Franklin Landers, AO11980.
Ned Schramm, AO12014.
Don McNeal, AO12018.
Francis Bassett Valentine, AO12129.
Hobart Reed Yeager, AO12148.
Harry Earl Fisher, AO12671.

Donald Frank Stace, AO12708.
John Ferral McBlain, AO12791.
Harlan Thurston McCormick, AO12808.
Joseph Vincent de Paul Dillon, AO12836.
Edward Barber, AO14632.
Edmund Clarence Langmead, AO14738.
James Millikin Bevans, AO14723.
×Paul Hanes Kemmer, AO14732.
Cecil Elmore Archer, AO14824.
×Louis Meline Merrick, AO14875.
Ray Henry Clark, AO14860.
Homer Wilbur Ferguson, AO14857.
Robert William Calvert Wimsatt, AO14823.
Donald Fowler Fritch, AO14835.
John Sharpe Griffith, AO14852.
Alfred August Kessler, Jr., AO14903.
Stephen Cecil Lombard, AO14942.
James Wrathall Spry, AO14953.
Gilbert Hayden, AO14998.
Hilbert Milton Wittkop, AO15006.
Leo Henry Dawson, AO15040.
Ralph Adel Snavely, AO15100.
John Wesley Warren, AO15139.
Patrick Weston Timberlake, AO15165.
Clyde Kenneth Rich, AO15167.
Russell J. Minty, AO15201.
James Francis Joseph Early, AO15212.
Thomas Merritt Lowe, AO15223.
Wilfrid Henry Hardy, AO15245.
Joseph Smith, AO15249.
Joseph Harold Hicks, AO15252.
Robert Chaffee Oliver, AO15275.
John Maurice Weikert, AO15290.
John George Salsman, AO15318.
James Michael Fitzmaurice, AO15346.
Walter Cornelius White, AO15371.
Archibald Yarborough Smith, AO15422.
David Jerome Ellinger, AO15532.
William Lloyd Richardson, AO15586.
John Phillips Kirkendall, AO15666.
Robert Roy Selway, Jr., AO15673.
Leonard Henry Rodieck, AO15729.
George Hinkle Steel, AO15743.
Edward Higgins White, AO15761.
William Olmstead Eareckson, AO15775.
Ralph Emanuel Fisher, AO15814.
Carl Joseph Crane, AO15936.
Howard Eugene Engler, AO15977.
George Francis Schulgen, AO15999.
Wilfred Joseph Paul, AO16010.
Glenn L. Davasher, AO16011.
Walter William Wise, AO41376.
Colby Maxwell Myers, AO16057.
William Ludlow Ritchie, AO16059.
Russell Edward Randall, AO16081.
Oscar Carl Maier, AO16096.
William Frank Steer, AO16101.
Wiley Thomas Moore, AO16102.
Joseph Cyril Augustin Denniston, AO16177.
John Halliday McCormick, AO16195.
Milton Taylor Hankins, AO16199.
John Porter Kidwell, AO16229.
Charles Henry Caldwell, AO16250.
James Keller De Armond, AO16274.
James Gordon Pratt, AO16308.
Lee Quintus Wasser, AO16310.
Benjamin Thomas Starkey, AO16314.
George Henry Dietz, AO16332.
Glenn Oscar Barcus, AO16339.
Brintnall Hill Merchant, AO28814.
Robert Nevill Isbell, AO28830.
Leo Isaac Herman, AO39533.
Wallace Stribling Dawson, AO41427.
Herbert William Ehrgott, AO16373.
Francis LeRoy Ankenbrandt, AO16375.
Francis Xavier Purcell, Jr., AO16380.
Raymond Coleman Maude, AO16382.
Alfred Henry Johnson, AO16398.
John Colt Beaumont Elliott, AO16411.
Samuel Russ Harris, Jr., AO16412.
Shelton Ezra Prudhomme, AO16427.
John Paul Doyle, AO16428.
Leon William Johnson, AO16429.
Basil Littleton Riggs, AO16459.
Joseph Halversen, AO16470.
Morris Robert Nelson, AO16490.
Kenneth Perry McNaughton, AO16491.
James Bell Burwell, AO16504.
Wilson Turner Douglas, AO16508.
×Marvin John McKinney, AO16510.
Thomas Benjamin White, AO16511.
Charles Herman Deerwester, AO16559.
Bernard Alexander Bridget, AO16561.
Charles Arthur Bassett, AO16564.
Dixon McCarty Allison, AO16571.
Alva Lee Harvey, AO16574.
William Edwin Carpenter, AO28872.
James William Andrew, AO16591.
George J. Eppright, AO16593.
Clarence Daniel Wheeler, AO16612.
Walter Sylvester Lee, AO16614.
Manning Eugene Tillery, AO16615.
Elmer Joseph Rogers, Jr., AO16622.
John Caswell Crosthwaite, AO16628.
×Clarence Shortridge Irvine, AO16630.
Ralph Emerson Holmes, AO16636.
Darr Hayes Alkire, AO16639.
×Thurston H. Baxter, AO16641.
John Titcomb Sprague, AO16645.
Yantis Halbert Taylor, AO16655.
Claire Stroh, AO16660.
Oscar Frederick Carlson, AO16676.
George Edley Henry, AO16679.
Signa Allen Gilkey, AO16685.
Reuben Kyle, Jr., AO16697.
Julius Aubrie Kolb, AO28873.
John Ludden Mousseau des Islets, AO28875.
Herbert Miller Kidner, AO41451.
Andrew Joseph Kerwin Malone, AO16715.
John Edward Bodle, AO16720.
Russell Scott, AO16722.
Burton Murdock Hovey, AO16723.
Dale Davis Fisher, AO16726.
Henry Weisbrod Dorr, AO16727.
Carlisle Iverson Ferris, AO16730.
Willard Roland Wolfinbarger, AO16732.
Monro MacCloskey, AO28922.
John Robert Crume, Jr., AO16747.
George Woodburne McGregor, AO16748.
Charles Albert Harrington, AO16750.
Elmer Blair Garland, AO16753.
Woodbury Megrew Burgess, AO16757.
Manuel Jose Asensio, AO16758.
Alvin Louis Pachynski, AO16763.
Laurence Sherman Kuter, AO16777.
George McCoy, Jr., AO16793.
Edward Pont Mechling, AO16798.
John Mills Sterling, AO16814.
Orrin Leigh Grover, AO16831.
Milton Merrill Towner, AO16850.
Matthew Kemp Deichelmann, AO16859.
Neil Bosworth Harding, AO16930.
Charles Bernard Overacker, Jr., AO17007.
Hoyt Leroy Prindle, AO17012.
Donald Wright Benner, AO17016.
Lawrence Henry Douthit, AO17020.
×George Robert Acheson, AO17021.
Frank Hamlet Robinson, AO17024.
Waldine Winston Messmore, AO17025.
Allen Ralph Springer, AO17027.
Joseph Gerard Hopkins, AO17032.
Clayton Cyril Berry, AO41472.
Joseph Battersby Duckworth, AO38613.
Maurice Milton Beach, AO28992.
Elmer Perry Rose, AO17044.
Ford J. Lauer, AO17048.
Fay Oliver Dice, AO17049.
Edward Harold Porter, AO17054.
Joseph Hampton Atkinson, AO17055.
Robert Leonard Schoenlein, AO17056.
Frederick William Ott, AO17057.
Wentworth Goss, AO17059.
James Leslie Daniel, Jr., AO17060.
Budd John Peaslee, AO17061.
Louie Percy Turner, AO17069.
William Tell Hefley, AO17079.
Robert Scott Israel, Jr., AO17087.
Donald Bertrand Smith, AO17089.
James Elbert Briggs, AO17103.
John Stewart Mills, AO17106.
George Warren Mundy, AO17112.
Alfred Rockwood Maxwell, AO17113.
Roscoe Charles Wilson, AO17120.
Walter Edwin Todd, AO17121.
Bryant LeMaire Boatner, AO17123.
Robert Frederick Tate, AO17128.
Samuel Robert Brentnall, AO17132.
Charles Franklin Born, AO17143.
Frank Fort Everest, AO17145.
John Jordan Morrow, AO17150.
Robert Loyal Easton, AO17155.
Norris Brown Harbold, AO17159.
×Charles Grant Goodrich, AO17166.
Alvord Van Patten Anderson, Jr., AO17172.
Thayer Stevens Olds, AO17179.
Robert Falligant Travis, AO17187.
William Henry Tunner, AO17195.
Ralph Edward Koon, AO17197.
Howard Graham Bunker, AO17200.
John Alexander Samford, AO17206.
Roger Maxwell Ramey, AO17231.
Forrest Gordon Allen, AO17236.
Samuel Egbert Anderson, AO17244.
Joseph Arthur Bulger, AO17251.
George Ferrow Smith, AO17258.
Allen Wilson Reed, AO17259.
×James Elmer Totten, AO17267.
Truman Hempel Landon, AO17268.
Harry Edgar Wilson, AO17274.
Robert Williams Warren, AO17276.
Delmar Taft Spivey, AO17278.
August Walter Kissner, AO17282.
Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., AO17299.
Donald Winston Titus, AO17302.
Emmett Felix Yost, AO17303.
Robert Kinder Taylor, AO17309.
James Wilson Brown, Jr., AO17316.
William Columbus Sams, AO17317.
James Francis Olive, Jr., AO17326.
×Edgar Alexander Sirmyer, Jr., AO17327.
Thomas Webster Steed, AO17331.
Albert George Hewitt, AO29021.
Joshua Hill Foster, Jr., AO29036.
Glynne Morgan Jones, AO41566.
Ralph Orville Brownfield, AO17385.
Joel Edward Mallory, AO17384.
George Washington Hansen, AO17390.
Aubry Lee Moore, AO17392.
Ronald Roosevelt Walker, AO17393.
Lloyd Harrison Tull, AO17394.
Frederic Ernst Glantzberg, AO17398.
Leland Samuel Stranathan, AO17400.
Ernest Keeling Warburton, AO17401.
×Le Roy Hudson, AO17402.
×Roger Vincent Williams, AO17406.
Frederick Archibald Pillet, AO17409.
Homer LeRoy Sanders, AO17412.
Draper Frew Henry, AO17413.
×Walter Robertson Agee, AO17415.
×Hansford Wesley Pennington, AO17417.
Murray Clarke Woodbury, AO17421.
William Alexander Robert Robertson, AO17425.
Marden Mellier Munn, AO29086.
John Williams Persons, AO17436.
William Chamberlayne Bentley, AO17437.
Edwin Lee Tucker, AO17443.
Edward Holmes Underhill, AO17448.
William Pryor Sloan, AO17452.
George Frost Kinzie, AO17453.
Albert Boyd, AO17455.
James Wayne McCauley, AO17456.
Edward Harrison Alexander, AO17458.
Frank Alton Armstrong, Jr., AO17459.
William Albert Matheny, AO17460.
Reginald Franklin Conroy Vance, AO17464.
William Lecel Lee, AO17465.
Dudley Durward Hale, AO17471.
×Herbert Leonard Grills, AO17474.
Benjamin Scovill Kelsey, AO17476.
Thomas Lee Mosley, AO17477.
Raymond Lloyd Winn, AO17478.
Kingston Eric Tibbetts, AO17480.
Richard Henry Lee, AO17481.
Lewis R. Parker, AO17483.
William Maurice Morgan, AO17485.
Edwin Minor Day, AO17487.
Jack Weston Wood, AO17488.
James Herbert Wallace, AO17490.
Don Zabriskie Zimmerman, AO17499.
Frederick Rodgers Dent, Jr., AO17504.
Harold Huntley Bassett, AO17505.
Howard Moore, AO17507.
John Floyd McCartney, AO17508.
Harry Gage Montgomery, Jr., AO17518.
Roger James Browne, AO17525.
Joseph Jennings Ladd, AO17526.
Richard David Wentworth, AO17527.
Thomas Ludwell Bryan, Jr., AO17541.
Harold Quiskie Huglin, AO17548.
Lawrence McIlroy Guyer, AO17553.
Donald Philip Graul, AO17557.
Charles Sommers, AO17561.

John Coleman Horton, AO17568.
×Marshall Stanley Roth, AO17572.
Sidney Andrew Ofsthun, AO17586.
William Evens Hall, AO17588.
Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr., AO17589.
Donald John Keirn, AO17591.
John Jackson O'Hara, Jr., AO17609.
Emery Scott Wetzel, AO17615.
William Lafayette Fagg, AO17617.
George Eldridge Keeler, Jr., AO17641.
William Fulton McKee, AO17661.
Ezekiel Wimberly Napier, AO17668.
Thomas Benton McDonald, AO17694.
Thomas Jefferson DuBose, AO17701.
Daniel Campbell Doubleday, AO17702.
Harlan Clyde Parks, AO17703.
Pearl Harvey Robey, AO17722.
Phineas Kimball Morrill, Jr., AO17766.
George Elston Price, AO17843.
Richard Clark Lindsay, AO17845.
John Gordon Fowler, AO17846.
John Lyle Nedwed, AO17847.
Paul Thomas Cullen, AO17852.
George Graham Northrup, AO17853.
Thomas Sarsfield Power, AO17854.
×Lloyd Harold Watnee, AO17856.
Philip David Coates, AO17857.
John Herold Bundy, AO17860.
Mills Spencer Savage, AO17861.
Harold Webb Bowman, AO17862.
Lorry Norris Tindal, AO17863.
Merlin Ingels Carter, AO17865.
John Walker Sessums, Jr., AO17866.
Charles Kenneth Moore, AO17867.
Wycliffe Eugene Steele, AO17870.
Roy Henry Lynn, AO17873.
×Robert Bruce Davenport, AO17874.
Donald Leander Putt, AO17875.
Merrill Davis Burnside, AO17878.
Hollingsworth Franklin Gregory, AO17879.
Harold Winfield Grant, AO17881.
Reuben Columbus Hood, Jr., AO17884.
Leslie Oscar Peterson, AO17885.
Floyd Bernard Wood, AO17887.
Norman Delbert Sillin, AO17889.
Flint Garrison, Jr., AO17891.
James Leroy Jackson, AO17892.
Chester Price Gilger, AO17893.
Hugh Arthur Parker, AO17894.
Thomas David Ferguson, AO17895.
William Basil Offutt, AO17898.
James Arthur Ronin, AO17902.
Kenneth Ross Crosher, AO17918.
Stuart Phillips Wright, AO17920.
Ivan Lonsdale Farman, AO17922.
William Alexander Schulgen, AO17923.
Daniel Beckett White, AO17924.
Edward Wharton Anderson, AO17932.
Winslow Carroll Morse, AO17934.
Casper Perrin West, AO17935.
William Leroy Kennedy, AO17936.
Jesse Auton, AO17938.
Robert Shuter Macrum, AO17942.
Charles Lawrence Munroe, Jr., AO17943.
Llewellyn Owen Ryan, AO17944.
Hanlon H. Van Auken, AO17950.
Robert Oswald Cork, AO17951.
Herbert Henry Tellman, AO17953.
John Koehler Gerhart, AO17954.
Elder Patteson, AO17958.
Francis Hopkinson Griswold, AO17959.
Robert Whitney Burns, AO17961.
Daniel Webster Jenkins, AO17962.
Clarence Frank Hegy, AO17964.
James Presnall Newberry, AO17965.
Stoyte Ogleby Ross, AO17967.
William John Clinch, AO17971.
Cornelius Burton Cosgrove, Jr., AO29396.
William Preston Nuckols, AO29416.
Jarred Vincent Crabb, AO17996.
Tom William Scott, AO17997.
John Hubert Davies, AO17999.
Edwin William Rawlings, AO18005.
Julius Kahn Lacey, AO18006.
George Frank McGuire, AO18008.
Oliver Stanton Picher, AO18009.
Morley Frederick Slaght, AO18014.
Roy Dale Butler, AO18015.
Richard August Grussendorf, AO18018.
John Hiett Ives, AO18019.
Frederick Earl Calhoun, AO18020.
Carl Ralph Feldmann, AO18021.
Ralph Powell Swofford, Jr., AO18026.
Paul Ernest Ruestow, AO18029.
George Fletcher Schlatter, AO18035.
Howard Monroe McCoy, AO18054.
Aubrey Kenneth Dodson, AO18065.
Mark Edward Bradley, Jr., AO18066.
Wiley Duncan Ganey, AO18069.
Thetus Cayce Odom, AO18075.
Walter Campbell Sweeney, Jr., AO18080.
Morris John Lee, AO18099.
David Hodge Baker, AO18120.
Thatcher Sampson, AO18128.
Troup Miller, Jr., AO18145.
William Dole Eckert, AO18147.
Millard Lewis, AO18163.
John Chesley Kilborn, AO18167.
Carl Amandus Brandt, AO18171.
Harold Lester Smith, AO18182.
Norman Ray Burnett, AO18189.
Richard Joseph O'Keefe, AO18198.
Ephraim Melmoth Hampton, AO18206.
Jack Griffin Pitcher, AO18208.
Joseph Arthur Miller, AO18211.
Francis Joseph Corr, AO18219.
Kurt Martin Landon, AO18220.
Daniel Anderson Cooper, AO18225.
Sory Smith, AO18241.
Theodore Quentin Graff, AO41787.
Samuel James Gormly, Jr., AO29472.
Ernest Franklin Williams, AO29560.
Edward Bond Gallant, AO29581.
Anthony Gerard Hunter, AO29584.
Daniel Francis Callahan, AO18368.
Marcellus Duffy, AO18373.
Robert Alan, AO18379.
Gordon Aylesworth Blake, AO18389.
Julian Merritt Chappell, AO18407.
Donald Norton Yates, AO18419.
Frank Arthur Bogart, AO18432.
Ernest Moore, AO18445.
Royden Eugene Beebe, Jr., AO18447.
Earle William Hockenberry, AO18454.
Henry Keppler Mooney, AO18479.
Robert Merrill Lee, AO18483.
Dean Coldwell Strother, AO18495.
Jacob Edward Smart, AO18516.
Lester LeRoy Hilman Kunish, AO18528.
Robert Edward Lee Eaton, AO18529.
×Carl Fillmore Damberg, AO18531.
Wendell Washington Bowman, AO18532.
Richard Spencer Carter, AO18542.
Hilbert Fred Muenter, AO18543.
John Clarence Gordon, AO18571.
Charles Bowman Dougher, AO18581.
David William Hutchison, AO18585.
Gerald Evan Williams, AO18604.
Edward Julius Timberlake, Jr., AO18619.
Edward Nolen Backus, AO29600.
Archie J. Old, Jr., AO29608.
James Lloyd Tarr, AO29634.
Alfred Fredrich Kalberer, AO29521.
Stanley Tanner Wray, AO18657.
Leo Peter Dahl, AO18699.
John Bevier Ackerman, AO18706.
John Paul McConnell, AO18728.
Joe William Kelly, AO18731.
John Clifford McCawley, AO18739.
×John Morgan Price, AO18740.
Daniel Stone Campbell, AO18751.
Kenneth Burton Hobson, AO18763.
John Reynolds Sutherland, AO18764.
Donald Linwood Hardy, AO18765.
Richard Tide Coiner, Jr., AO18766.
Charles Albert Clark, Jr., AO18776.
Harvey Porter Huglin, AO18780.
George Dowery Campbell, Jr., AO18783.
Charles Hardin Anderson, AO18785.
Hunter Harris, Jr., AO18808.
Charles Albert Piddock, AO18813.
Andrew Meulenberg, AO18827.
Edwin Guldlin Simenson, AO18829.
Robert Haynes Terrill, AO18833.
Thomas Connell Darcy, AO18840.
Clifford Harcourt Rees, AO18847.
Richard Henry Smith, AO18850.
Eugene Porter Mussett, AO18853.
Edward Willis Suarez, AO18855.
×Herbert Bishop Thatcher, AO18865.
Robert Broussard Landry, AO18868.
Frank Greenleaf Jamison, AO18874.
Romulus Wright Puryear, AO18894.
William Madison Garland, AO18900.
James Walter Gurr, AO18906.
Robert Lee Scott, Jr., AO18908.
Robert Reginald Conner, AO51359.
Paul Smith Blair, AO29813.
Edward E. Toro, AO38728.
Thomas Samuel Moorman, Jr., AO18998.
Thomas Burns Hall, AO19010.
Travis Monroe Hetherington, AO19022.
Harold Cooper Donnelly, AO19040.
William Oscar Senter, AO19042.
Sidney Francis Giffin, AO19045.
Harold Roth Maddux, AO19086.
Laurence Browning Kelley, AO19108.
Robert Totten, AO19128.
Milton Fredrick Summerfelt, AO19153.
Gabriel Poillon Disosway, AO19156.
Franklin Stone Henley, AO19169.
Cordes Fredrich Tiemann, AO19193.
Samuel Abner Mundell, AO19206.
Stephen B. Mack, AO19240.
Nelson Parkyn Jackson, AO19253.
Sydney Dwight Grubbs, Jr., AO19271.
Charles Hoffman Pottenger, AO19290.
Kermit Douglas Stevens, AO30128.
William Milton Gross, AO19463.
Donald Robert Hutchinson, AO20441.

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be first lieutenants

Joseph Cary Wheeler, AO50326.
Jack David Elliott, AO56455.
Henry Simon, AO50325.
Hubert Dale Ehrlich, AO50329.
Robert Anderson Gambell, AO38437.
James Anthony DeYonker, AO56456.
David Wallace Wicks, AO56458.
Edward Joseph Saylor, AO56457.
Richard Keith Brown, AO50331.
Robert Benire McMurray, AO38445.
Ruffin Walker Gray, AO38421.
Edward Patrick McNeff, AO56459.
Cornell Robert Christenson, AO50332.
Charles William Getz, 3d, AO56461.
Herbert Leroy Pickett, AO56460.
Jack Allen Robinson, AO50333.
Werner George Goering, AO38425.
William Ralph Wright, AO50335.
Russell James McElroy, AO56462.
William Murray McDonald, AO50336.
Thomas Lowell Huddleston, AO56463.
Aubrey Clinton Adcock, Jr., AO56464.
Philip Fetler, AO50337.
John Henry Griffin, AO56465.
Donald Gordon Shirley, AO56466.
Calvin Gilbert Bass, AO50338.
Orin Emsley Nutting, AO50339.
John Francis Jamieson, AO38424.
Edward John Kinney, AO56467.
Alvin Glenn Kouts, AO56468.
Denis Ray Edwards, AO56469.
Harry George Skinner, AO56470.
Charles Eugene Daly, AO56471.
Charles Brandon Gresham, AO50340.
John Patrick Gaffney, AO50334.
William Francis Sullivan, AO50341.
Anthony Benedict Gallo, AO56472.
Curtis Lloyd Utterback, AO56474.
John Edwin Smith, AO56473.
Donald Jack Seed, AO38426.
Willard Wendell Yockey, AO56475.
Duke Cameron Horner, AO56476.
Ernest James Ticknor, AO38428.
Arthur Milton Gray, AO50344.
Herbert Smith McKinney, AO38429.
Lonnie Otis Ratley, Jr., AO56477.
James Roy Starnes, AO38431.
Orville Ralph Gravelle, AO56479.
Robert Francis Myers, AO38433.
Vaughn E. Denning, AO56478.
Frank Floyd Cannon, AO56480.
Michael John Nisos, AO41321.
John Robert Stoner, AO38434.
Rex Kirkland Stoner, Jr., AO38435.
Paul Pearson Taylor, AO56482.
George Villard Frost, AO56481.
James Thomas Weldon, AO38436.
Howard Alexander Courtney, AO50348.
John Kessler, Jr., AO56485.
Forrest Richard Miller, AO50349.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grades hereinafter stated:

LIEUTENANTS

Thomas G. Lewis
Jack W. Welty

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

James W. Herb
Herbert F. Mills, Jr.

ENSIGNS

James H. Forbes, Jr.
Albert F. MacDonald, Jr.
Robert A. Weir

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from June 4, 1948:

Jack F. Andrus
Wallace D. Baldwin
Ernest M. Brides
Stanley H. Bueg
Samuel F. Catterlin
John A. Chalbeck
Edward J. Cronin
Vernon L. Crow
William H. Elliott
Glenn E. Faucett
William M. Flynn
John C. Hammel, Jr.
Arthur W. Hanton
Harold R. Herndon
Francis J. Hohl
Lee S. Houchins
Donald Hubbard
Harold F. Knudsen
Francis P. Koval
Louis Kriser
Louis F. Memoli
Thomas E. Reilly, Jr.
Ernest E. Rivers
Charles W. Safanda
Thomas W. Schaaf
William C. Sharp
Donald K. Stitt
William R. Tappe
Robert E. Tigner
Craig McD. White
Eugene H. Whittlessey
George M. A. Willows
Arthur O. Wolf

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from June 4, 1948:

William Kleck, Jr.
Raymond D. Phillips
Harry L. Rimmer, Jr.

The following-named (civilian-college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

John W. Randall
"J" F. Stuart

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Billie J. Cole
Joan T. Ernst
Ferrell L. Greer
Sarah C. Hargrove
Betty J. Jones
Elizabeth R. Meldahl
Margaret E. Park
Elizabeth C. Riggs
Agnes M. Roberts
Doris F. Travis
Frances E. Weslowski

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Erik A. Johnson

LIEUTENANTS

Mitchell K. Disney
Edward G. Grant
Frederic M. Lloyd 3d
Carl E. Lundin, Jr.
James H. Roberton

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Kenneth S. Scott

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Garner L. Lewis
John B. Miller
James T. Proctor
Robert E. Walsh
Gilbert A. Webb
Arthur J. Wilets

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

ENSIGN

David R. Stutler

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Emma L. Gamble

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Jean B. Knecht
Mary E. Orlando
Mary A. E. Toepfer

ENSIGNS

Elizabeth E. Clark
Ethelyn E. England
Elizabeth G. Gaffney
Anna M. Steinmetz

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948:

Charles DeArmond
Robert P. Hilton
Wayne G. Shear

Richard E. Fahrenwald (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

Philip J. McEleney (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

George P. Edgerton (civilian-college graduate) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Glenn E. Drewyer
James P. Moran

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Jonathan M. Allen
William L. Chapman
Holt B. Maddux
Robert E. Rowand
Robert W. Sharp, Jr.
Charles R. Sullivan

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

George S. deShazo
William I. Gullett

LIEUTENANTS

Leonard M. Kraske
Jeremiah T. Sunde
Allan L. Wallace

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Luke J. Braxmeier
Gage Colby
Robert G. Martin

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy.

LIEUTENANTS

Eddy L. Harris
Ingrid C. Suess

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Louise J. Bartlett
Jane H. Farr
Lillie M. Harwood
Gayle M. Lang

ENSIGNS

Ann Belaeff
Isabel V. Hunsecker
Hedwig L. Kratz
Louise W. Sharp
Marita D. Petit
Charlotte S. Rasmussen

IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS TO TEMPORARY GRADE

To the temporary grade of major general

Oliver P. Smith

To the temporary grade of brigadier general

John T. Selden

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Thomas G. Swales, pastor, Broad Street Methodist Church, Norwich, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we are conscious of the presence of Thy reality. We know that Thou art God, and from Thee we receive strength that will enable us to face life with all of its situations. Truly Thou art our refuge and strength and a very present help at all times. Help us to cast our burdens upon Thee, knowing that Thou wilt sustain us, for Thou wilt not cause the righteous to be moved. We thank Thee that in the midst of uncertainty we can cling to the religious certainties of life. Help us to listen to the message Thou hast for us.

We pray that Thou wilt bless our President, our Speaker, and all others who have the privilege of guiding and directing the affairs of this great country of ours. Thou hast been our help in ages past, and we look to Thee for present guidance.

We thank Thee for hands to help bear the burdens of mankind, for eyes to see things as they are, for ears to hear the truth, and for minds to think through the facts that are presented to us. Help us to be open-minded. May we not be conditioned by our own selfish desires but motivated by high ideals.

We pray that we may continue to practice the Golden Rule of doing unto others as we would have them do unto us. Help us, Father, to be examples to those with whom we associate. We pray that we may be steadfast, always abounding in the love of God.

Grant us wisdom; grant us courage for the solving of the problems which confront us today. In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the President pro tempore had appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Army and the Air Force.
3. Department of Commerce.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Post Office Department.
6. Department of the Treasury.
7. Housing and Home Finance Agency.
8. National Archives.
9. Veterans' Administration.

THE BRITISH SOCIALISTS SAY "APRIL FOOL" TO UNCLE SAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, prior to the passing of ERP—Marshall plan—by the House of Representatives, the socialistic Government of Britain was just spending, so it was said, the last pound in the Exchequer. Now that ERP has been catapulted through the House on a wave of hysteria, the Socialist Government of Britain announces with gusto that the Government had a surplus of $2,544,000,000 for the fiscal year which ended March 31, the very day ERP passed the House. This explains

why the proponents insisted that ERP pass before this British announcement came through. The British Socialists have pulled a fast April Fool's Day on the taxpayers of this country.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Washington Post of Thursday, April 1, 1948:

BRITAIN TAKES OVER ELECTRIC UTILITIES

LONDON, Thursday, April 1.—Britain took ownership last midnight of all the Nation's electric utilities, sixth major enterprise to be nationalized under the Labor government's Socialist program.

One of the first developments under state control will be higher rates for a large proportion of domestic consumers in urban areas.

Chairmen of 3 of the 14 regional boards that will administer the industry said domestic rates would have to be increased to meet rising costs, including higher prices for coal.

Other enterprises nationalized since the Labor government came to power in mid-1945 include coal, civil aviation, inland transport, the Bank of England, and cable and wireless.

Properties taken over by the Government included 170 generating stations and between 500 and 600 distribution systems employing 98,000 people.

Stockholders in private companies will be paid in Treasury stock, whose value will be announced tonight.

For municipally owned plants, the Government will pay only enough to meet net outstanding debts.

BRITAIN ANNOUNCES $2,500,000,000 SURPLUS

LONDON, March 31.—The Treasury announced tonight the Government had a £363,000,000 ($2,544,000,000) surplus for the fiscal year ended today.

It was double the surplus estimated last November.

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress established the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as the supreme court of the hundreds of savings and loan institutions in this country. The Board was set up for the protection of these institutions and their shareholders. That was the intent of the Congress. Unfortunately, however, the Board has been used as a political instrument for the private gain of the Democratic Party. It is shot through with politics, and some of the decisions of the Board are out-and-out bids for political support. It is no longer a free and independent agency, such as the Federal Trade Commission and other bureaus. I ask that the House investigate the political tampering with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

There is so much internal wrangling in the Home Loan Bank Board that recently one of the Board members, Nathaniel Dyke, Jr., was dismissed because he refused to go along with policies with which he disagreed. The Dyke case, I believe, points up more clearly than anything I could say the weaknesses and the inevitable danger to savings and loan institutions inherent in the present structure of the Home Loan Bank Board. The Board is in great need of drastic changes, and only the Congress can do that.

Until recently John H. Fahey was Chairman of the Board, which he ran with an iron fist. J. Alston Adams and Mr. Dyke were the other two members. The two Board members were, in effect, forbidden to participate in the Board's decisions. In fact, it was because Mr. Dyke, in at least one case, refused to go along with Mr. Fahey that he was dismissed.

This was the now-famous case involving the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association which was taken away from its shareholders and placed in the hands of a conservator. Mr. Dyke objected to that high-handed method of treating a savings and loan institution. He saw no reason for such action, and he was not afraid to say so. Mr. Fahey and his henchmen then went to the White House and demanded the dismissal of Mr. Dyke. Mr. Dyke had had only an interim appointment, and he was not reappointed to the Board this year. It was one of the most cruel double crosses I have seen in many years, particularly in view of the fact that Mr. Dyke had been promised the chairmanship on the resignation of Mr. Fahey.

Curiously enough, the very things that Mr. Dyke fought for and the policies for which he argued have now been established by the Home Loan Bank Board. The Long Beach Savings and Loan Association has been returned to its rightful owners. Many other Dyke policies have since been adopted. Mr. Dyke's dismissal is a national disgrace.

The Dyke case calls attention to the hypocritical cry of the Truman administration that competent and responsible businessmen cannot be secured for Government service. Mr. Truman and those around him say that high-grade business executives refused to serve in Washington because of the low salaries paid Government workers. They say that these salaries are not sufficient to attract good men. Well, of course, that is not true either. It is just another political hoax being perpetrated on the American people. There are scores of able and wealthy business executives who are anxious to serve their country, but when they witness the shameful treatment of Mr. Dyke and others we cannot blame them for not coming to Washington.

Mr. Dyke is no job holder or seeker. On the contrary, the 6 years he served his Government in Washington cost him thousands of dollars out of his own pocket. He is a wealthy businessman from Little Rock, Ark. The financial returns of the best job in Washington could not possibly interest him. He came to Washington in 1942 to inquire about priorities for his vast lumber business and the first thing he knew they gave him a desk at the War Production Board and asked him to help solve the many lumber-production problems. Mr. Dyke readily agreed to the request. After that he was given one assignment after another because of his superior knowledge of the lumber, building-materials, banking, and home-financing industries. Mr. Dyke heads up some 20 different corporations from coast-to-coast dealing in these various types of businesses, which are really integrated under the heading of homes and the things that go into their construction and financing.

After he had completed his assignment with the War Production Board, Mr. Dyke was asked to serve as consultant to the War Mobilization Board. Later, he went over as consultant to the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and from there he went to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

In all of this period, from 1942 until the summer of 1947, Mr. Dyke received no compensation from the Federal Government. Living in Washington and trying to run his business on the side cost him money out of his own pocket, as I have said. In the summer of 1947 Mr. Dyke was made a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and for the first time accepted Government compensation which he was required to do by law. He did not last long, for he clashed almost immediately with Mr. Fahey over policies with which he disagreed. The final blow-up came when Mr. Fahey placed the Long Beach Association in the hands of a conservator.

Now I see by the papers that Mr. Dyke is being mentioned for a top executive job in the European relief program and in this connection I wish to insert in the RECORD a story from the American Banker of March 23, 1948:

DYKE POSSIBLE CHOICE TO ADMINISTER ERP
AMERICAN BANKER BUREAU

WASHINGTON, March 22.—Nathaniel Dyke, Jr., formerly with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, previously an adviser of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and during the war on the War Production Board, is being prominently mentioned as under White House consideration for administrator of the European relief program.

And another from the Washington Post of March 24, 1948, which appeared in the column of Jerry Kluttz:

Politics: Bumbling White House operators are trying to interest Nathaniel Dyke, Jr., in a top job in the European Relief Administration. The Dyke story is one of the reasons why the President finds it difficult to persuade good men to enter Federal service. Dyke was made a member of the Home Loan Bank Board and he was promised the chairmanship. The next thing he knew he was fired. Now the White House assistant who knifed him is talking him up for an ERA job.

Good men will be needed to run the ERP and they are going to be hard to find, only because of the disgraceful treatment of Mr. Dyke and others.

For Members of the House who are interested in a detailed account of the Dyke story, I suggest reading the back files of Banktrends, a Washington weekly newsletter edited and published by U. V. Wilcox, one of the country's outstanding financial reporters.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution from the National Guard Association of Massachusetts.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

APRIL FOOL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, when I pick up this morning's Washington Post and see that Britain last year made a $2,544,000,000 surplus for the year ending March 31, 1948, and then think that this is the first day of April, called April Fool's Day, as far as the action on Congress is concerned, today might as well have been yesterday so far as fooling the American people. Britain has fooled our legislators.

At a time when I feel depressed, let me quote from Abraham Lincoln:

> I do the best I know. The very best I can; and I mean to keep right on doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference.

Still quoting, let me read you part of a poem by Ella Wheeler Wilcox:

> Let those who have failed take courage,
> Though the enemy seemed to have won,
> Though his rank be strong, if he be in the wrong,
> The battle is not yet done.
> For sure as the morning follows
> The darkest hour of night,
> No question is ever settled
> Until it is settled right.
>
> O man bowed down with labor,
> O woman young, yet old;
> O heart oppressed in the toiler's breast,
> And crushed by the power of gold,
> Keep on with your weary battle
> Against triumphant night;
> No question is ever settled
> Until it is settled right.

ERP was not a settlement; I am sure it was a colossal blunder by the Congress; a hardship on America; a real mistake. Time will tell.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] received permission to insert his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article. The Government Printing Office advises that it will exceed 2 pages of the RECORD and will cost $177.50. The gentleman from Georgia is unavoidably absent this morning. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Eamon de Valera at the Mayflower Hotel the other evening.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Judge Eugene V. Alessandroni.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce endorsing statehood for Alaska.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Sacramento Bee.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

AMENDMENTS TO MARSHALL PLAN PROPOSALS

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, in the final hours of debate yesterday on the Marshall proposals, I proposed certain amendments which were adopted by the House and which will have far-reaching effects in the furnishing of relief by means of individual gift packages to needy people in Europe. Because of the shortness of time, I did not have an opportunity to fully explain the amendments, although they were accepted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I have inserted a statement in explanation of the amendments. This is contained on page 3849 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 31. I urge that the Members of the House read that portion of the RECORD.

The effect of these amendments is going to be that we will have a tremendous increase in the number of gift packages sent by individuals in this country to persons in the 16 Marshall plan countries of Europe. The amendments have the effect of reducing the postage rates on such packages by approximately 75 percent and making it mandatory that the governments of the participating countries change their laws so as to permit the tax-free entry of such relief packages.

By way of example, it should be pointed out that in many cases the postage rate on relief packages to Europe at present is as much as, or more than, the value of the article sent. For instance, the postage rate to occupied Germany from my home city of St. Paul, Minn., is 14 cents per pound. This means that it would cost $3.08 to send a 22-pound package to Germany. Under the amendments to the ERP bill accepted by the House yesterday, the Administrator is required to provide for free transportation of such relief packages from the port of embarkation in America to the port of landing in Europe and to provide by the use of revolving-fund moneys set up under the plan for additional free transportation of such packages from the port of landing to the place of residence of the addressee. The sender of such a package pays the postage only from his home in the United States to the port of embarkation. Instead of paying $3.08 as at present, the sender of a 22-pound package from St. Paul, Minn., would be required to pay only 74 cents. This is a reduction of more than 75 percent.

The inclusion of this provision in the bill will undoubtedly have the effect of encouraging more people to send more packages to Europe. This will mean quicker recovery and lessening of the financial burden on the Government of the United States.

The amendment adopted yesterday will serve another purpose. To wit, it will bring about the abolishment of import duties now imposed by many of the European countries on relief packages sent there since the amendment makes it a condition precedent to the receipt of the relief under the Marshall plan that the recipient countries agree with the Secretary of State for the free entry of such packages. In recent months many of these foreign countries have raised their import duties even on necessaries of life such as food and clothing.

Since such a large portion of funds appropriated by the ERP bill go strictly to relief, as distinguished from rehabilitation projects, it is submitted that the proposals accepted yesterday are most meritorious in that they will bring about speedier relief in Europe and build up a great amount of good will through individual giving between peoples of America and destitute peoples of Europe.

I importune the House conferees on this bill to be adamant in their insistence that these worth-while amendments be retained in the bill when it goes into conference. The provisions of the Senate bill are not as intelligently generous in these provisions as are the terms of the House bill. It is urged that the conferees on the part of the House exercise their utmost faculties to insure the retention of these meritorious provisions of the bill.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE DRIVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of us were shocked to learn through the radio and accounts of the morning press that certain alleged Negro leaders were advocating what they call a "civil disobedience drive" against any reinstitution of selective service or universal military training at this crucial time in the history of the world.

Since both Houses of Congress have by a substantial majority now approved the so-called Marshall or European recovery plan, it is now imperative that we take immediate steps to increase our military forces.

Recent acts on the part of high officials in the Democratic Party have greatly increased any racial tension that may have heretofore existed. We simply

must have unity now if we are to survive. The very last thing that any sincere American would want to do is to contribute to any already formidable problem. On the contrary, every true American should use every legitimate method to suppress and eradicate any influence that would tend to divide us.

We of the South admit that we have a race problem which we have been facing squarely. Although greatly handicapped by many impeding factors, progress is being made in the solution of race relationships. Sincere and effective efforts are being made to provide equal opportunities for education and gainful employment for the colored population. My colleagues in the Congress who represent various Southern States have always been acutely aware of the Negro problem and they have tirelessly worked for the Negro's advancement in every phase of life. Whether the fact is acknowledged or not, the best friends of the Negro are southerners of high principle who know the Negro better than any people in any other section of these United States could possibly know him.

The South has moved a long way in solving its Negro problem. That we have been moving in the right direction is evidenced by the fact that racial tension in the South, until the announcement by the President of his civil-rights program, is today at the lowest pitch in history, and understanding between Negroes and whites is growing day by day, year by year. Anything that tends to interrupt this ordered process of improvement constitutes a potential danger to the entire question of relations between the two races.

I repeat, interference is dangerous. Furthermore, interference can be disastrous when it is based—as it so often is—upon a complete lack of understanding of the problems of the South. That is why the President's recent message on civil rights has met with such opposition from southern Democratic leaders. For the President's civil-rights program includes those very measures that are designed to disrupt the entire southern approach to the racial problem. His acquiescence in the civil-rights affair was the major blunder of President Truman's otherwise excellent record as Chief Executive of the United States. We must believe that the President was poorly advised, that he did not weigh carefully the real import of his message or understand fully its consequences for the Democratic Party and the people of the South. Surely President Truman must realize that the southern race situation cannot safely be subjected to the Gordian knot technique. There is no short cut. There is nc easy way. The problems that exist in the South between the Negro and white races will be solved to the full satisfaction of all concerned if the South is left alone to solve them without outside interference and pressure techniques.

Intelligent Negroes in the South recognize this fact. They do not interpret the barrage of racial propaganda from other sections as contributory and helpful to their uplift. On the contrary, they are seriously concerned lest the inflammatory schemes of the agitators undo all the progress that has been so painfully achieved during the past three-quarters of a century. Those who agitate in the South for so-called civil rights are actually doing the Negro an irreparable harm.

Southern people are rightfully alarmed by the tendency to ignore the fact that there is a line which must not be crossed. We are anxious for the Negro to achieve equality of opportunity for education, for economic advancement, for culture. But that goal cannot be reached by an insistence on unrestricted social equality. Any recommendation which fails to recognize this fundamental fact must be regarded with distrust.

The President's recommendation for antidiscrimination legislation, in common with the programs of all the radical, left-wing communistic elements of the Nation, ignores this one essential condition. We must interpret the President's recommendation to mean the complete abolition of segregation among the races. Until it is acknowledged that segregation is the line which must not be crossed, the South cannot and will not accept any help, however well-intended, from people in other areas of the Nation.

We welcome any and all efforts to assist us and we believe that assistance can be extremely helpful—provided the basic principle of segregation is not menaced. We insist upon the recognition of the fact that the race situation in the Southland is not the same as the Negro situation in any northern State, and that the methods employed in many northern areas just will not work in the South. Segregation is the shield of southern culture and civilization. Once that shield is pierced the very life of the South is in danger. We welcome the assistance of any American citizen who is willing to recognize this one vital principle.

Yes, we can use help, but not the kind of help we are getting from President Truman, not the kind of help we are getting from the President's so-called civil-rights program, not the kind of help we are getting from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, not the kind of help we are getting from the Communist Party. We cannot use that kind of help. To paraphrase the President's own St. Patrick's Day speech: "The price is too high—we are not buying."

If these people want to help us, they can demonstrate their sincerity by working with us to build up the South economically. They can join our fight to eliminate unjust economic discriminations against the people of the South, discrimination against southern industry and agriculture in the form of inequitable freight rates. Let them pitch in and help the Southern States to develop their economic resources, promote expansion of southern industry, give southern agriculture an opportunity to compete on even terms with the rest of the Nation. The South's Negro problem is fundamentally a problem of education, and the South's education problems are fundamentally financial. Give us the opportunity, without interference and outside discrimination, to develop southern enterprise and raise the general standard of living among our people, and the first step will have been taken toward a final solution of the problem of equal opportunity for Negroes.

If these organizations must fight for a cause, let them direct toward these ends the tremendous amount of time, money, and energy they are now devoting to their unholy crusade to break through the retaining wall of southern culture—segregation.

Within the concept of segregation, the people of the South are today bending every effort to provide equal opportunity for Negroes. We are moving rapidly toward the goal of equal educational opportunity. Southern States are spending more on Negro education than at any time in history. Increasing sums of money are being allocated for Negro health programs, hospitalization, social welfare, and recreation. This is both a difficult and a costly task, but we are determined to see it through. The South is rich in culture and potentialities, but the per capita monetary income in the States of the South is far below that of our more prosperous northern neighbors. An entirely disproportionate share of that per capita income is required to carry on public education for Negro and white alike. Our schools remain relatively poor in spite of the heavy tax burdens imposed for school purposes. The Southern States contain 28 percent of the population of the Nation, educate 32 percent of the children of the Nation, but receive only 8 percent of the national income on a per capita basis.

In spite of this staggering handicap, the people of the Southern States have made valiant strides toward improving social conditions. We shall not permit that progress to be jeopardized by either well-meaning but ill-advised interference, or communistic techniques of propaganda and agitation. Segregation is the line that must not be crossed. Segregation is the only sensible answer to the racial situation. American statesmen throughout our history have recognized this truth. Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, two of our stanchest supporters of real civil rights, realized that the Negro and white races cannot live together peacefully except on the basis of segregation. The great Negro leaders have accepted and confirmed this view. Booker T. Washington deplored the efforts of those who sought to break the social barriers between Negro and white. He said:

> In all things which are purely social, we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.

We of the South are not indifferent to the welfare of the Negro. Long experience has convinced us that the Negro's welfare is best promoted in separate schools, separate churches, separate communities, separate railroad cars. We can be divided in these things, yet united in all things essential to mutual progress.

In these trying hours, our great country, which has been called the melting pot of the world, cannot survive unless all of us work and pray for the preservation of the principles which contribute to our strength and security.

BERLIN CUT OFF BY RUSSIA

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the very latest edition of the Washington News which carries the headline "Berlin cut off." The gist of the story is that the Soviet authorities have closed all rail and highway communications into the capital of Germany. I cannot imagine a more serious threat to the peace of the world, nor can I imagine a more direct challenge to the Congress of the United States. That challenge means that we must, without further delay, consider and pass legislation providing for the reinstitution of selective service so that we may bring our armed forces up to their requisite strength and be prepared for any emergency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. TRIMBLE (at the request of Mr. HAYS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SAME OLD MACLEISH

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune entitled "Same Old MacLeish."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, a dizzy-headed poet, Archibald MacLeish, has sounded off condemning the House Committee on Un-American Activities. MacLeish came from my congressional district. For all of the fine patriotic people back home Mr. Speaker, I apologize for Mr. MacLeish's coming from that wonderful congressional district. He was a misfit there and went away.

For the balance of my minute, Mr. Speaker, let me bow my head and pray that he may some day recover from his dizziness and keep quiet until he does.

Be sure to read the Chicago Daily Tribune editorial of today, as follows:

SAME OLD MAC LEISH

Archibald MacLeish, the poet whose native dizziness was heightened by the whirl given him by Mr. Roosevelt, has broken his vow of silence just when people were beginning to hope they had heard the last from him. MacLeish, in condemning the House Committee on Un-American Activities, states that the committee "has done more in a year and a half to breach the defenses of freedom and to introduce the wooden horse of terror into the United States than all the Communists on earth."

All the Communists on earth would presumably include Stalin's Russia, which has bowled over one helpless country after another in its avowed march toward world domination; the Communist Party in the United States, which is dedicated to the destruction of the Republic, and all of its agents and fellow travelers who are stirring up class, race, and religious hatreds, trying to subvert the labor unions, and engaging in a thousand and one other conspiratorial activities to wreck freedom in America.

MacLeish was never distinguished for good sense when he was busy helping Roosevelt gum up the war as head of the New Deal propaganda establishment called the "Office of Facts and Figures," as a self-appointed prophet of millennial informationalism while on the pay roll as Librarian of Congress, in his activities as Assistant Secretary of State, or in his capacity as an administration mouthpiece in the United Nations. He has, however, never made a sillier statement than his latest.

He is of such tender sensibility toward Communists that he overlooks what his political bedmate, General Marshall, calls the Communist "reign of terror" in Czechoslovakia in order to view goggle-eyed a fancied "terror" here. The Committee on Un-American Activities hasn't shot or sent anybody to jail out of hand. Only the Communists are doing that. All it has done is to turn up a lot of Communists in Government and elsewhere and to designate some bureaucrats who certainly are under obligation to explain why Communists are their chosen associates.

HENRY WALLACE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished and amiable Professor Einstein is reported in the journals of the day to hold the theory that Henry Wallace can save us at home and abroad. It has often been noted that not more than a dozen persons can understand the Einstein theory.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. 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. 35]

Abbitt	Beall	Brooks
Allen, Ill.	Bell	Buck
Andresen, August H.	Bender	Buckley
	Bland	Busbey
Andrews, Ala.	Bloom	Chapman
Andrews, N. Y.	Boykin	Clark
Clippinger	Hill	Passman
Cole, N. Y.	Holifield	Pfeifer
Combs	Jackson, Calif.	Poulson
Cox	Jarman	Rains
Cravens	Jenkins, Pa.	Ramey
Dawson, Ill.	Jennings	Reeves
Delaney	Kee	Richards
Dingell	King	Rivers
Dirksen	Lesinski	Rizley
Douglas	Ludlow	Rooney
Eaton	Manasco	Sadowski
Feighan	Mason	Sikes
Grant, Ala.	Miller, Nebr.	Stratton
Hartley	Morgan	Taylor
Harvey	Murray, Wis.	Thomas, N. J.
Havenner	Norrell	West
Hébert	Norton	
Hendricks	Owens	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief announcement for the information of the Members. I understand it has now been definitely established that a message on the tax-reduction bill will be here at noon tomorrow, and it is expected that prompt action will be taken on that measure. It is possible that the conference action on the so-called foreign-aid bill will be completed today, in which event it is my hope that final action on the bill can be taken tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I obtained a unanimous-consent request to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a Lincoln Day address by Dr. Paul Austin Wolfe. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $195.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a mature appraisal of congressional feeling as the ERP debate came to a close was given by the veteran radio commentator, George Reedy, this morning. While I do not necessarily subscribe to the precise analysis of the motives given by Mr. Reedy, it is of interest to note his comments, which were as follows:

The European recovery program is now for all practical purposes the foreign policy of the United States. There are still disagreements to be ironed out and technicalities to be handled, but, basically, there

is no doubt that we are committed to the measure.

What little doubt may have existed was decisively removed last night. The bill was approved by one of the largest House votes in recent years. Nothing remains now except a get-to-gether with the Senate over the final version of the legislation.

It may seem strange to those who remember the twenties that this country would ever approve such a bill. It has not been too long since the United States was definitely in the isolationist column. Americans wanted no part of Europe.

And yet today we are committed to rebuilding the shattered cities of the Old World and putting that continent back on its economic feet. Furthermore, we have taken that step knowing full well that it means depriving ourselves of many luxuries.

It is impossible to overestimate the historic importance of that decision. It goes far beyond any foreign-policy legislation ever proposed by the late President Roosevelt. It sets the United States upon a course never before tried by any nation.

Despite the overwhelming majority, the Members of the House did not vote for the bill with enthusiasm. To those around the Chamber yesterday, the uneasiness was obvious. Several legislators said openly they did not like the measure, but could see no other path.

That was the argument that clinched the final decision. It was not that every Member believed deeply in the European relief program. It was simply that most of them could see no alternative other than war. They decided to take the gamble.

Of course, the bill could never have been passed were it not for the fear of Soviet expansion. It should be stressed that the European recovery program is not the original Marshall plan. It has gone far beyond that stage.

The Marshall plan, as it was first proposed, was simply a program for rebuilding Europe. It was based on the idea that it was cheaper to get European economy running again than to go on giving hand-outs to the people of foreign countries.

Many shrewd observers of the political scene believe that measure could not have been jammed through Congress. They think it would have been defeated by a large vote. Something other than a recovery bill was needed to capture the vote.

That something other was provided by a mustached gentleman named Joseph Stalin. It was he and not Secretary of State Marshall who persuaded Congress to approve the Marshall plan. Had he kept a zipper on his lip, it might never have seen the light of day.

The measure that passed the House late yesterday was openly a bill to fight Communist imperialism. It was based on the belief that we should build up strong democratic countries in western Europe as a check to the Soviet Union.

The supporters of the bill believed privately that there was no other way of checking communism short of war. They admitted that it was a gamble, but they said that the gamble was worth taking. Only time will tell whether they were right.

At any rate, for good or bad, the United States has been committed to the program. We have set our sights on the goal of world leadership through the Marshall plan. Once on that path there is no turning back. We must walk it to the end.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is now seriously considering the appropriation of billions of dollars to aid Europe, and millions for aid in other parts of the world. We contemplate expending large sums to strengthen the armed forces, inasmuch as this Nation is faced with problems that are world-wide and far-reaching and calculated to tax the statesmanship of the liberty loving people everywhere.

While all of this is going on, what do we find at home—here in the United States of America? On the 15th day of March this country was plunged into a coal strike, the results of which may rock the very foundations of our economic structure. The country is now faced with the sorry spectacle of one labor leader defying all orderly processes of Government. Is there anyone so naive as to believe for one moment that John L. Lewis is not responsible for the present coal strike? Is there any one who honestly believes that some 350,000 union members all decided to quit work simultaneously—without the guiding influence of John L. Lewis? No, that labor leader is defying the law of the land, and the administration is faced with the solemn responsibility of acting under the law in the interest of the people.

I have looked into the matter and in order that the record may be clear I shall briefly summarize the issues involved in this coal strike: A collective bargaining agreement was entered into and became effective the first of July 1947. In that agreement there was a provision which permitted the so-called welfare fund to be financed by collecting from the producers of coal throughout the land the sum of 10 cents per ton on every ton produced. This was to be an irrevocable trust fund, and the representatives of the coal mine owners named a trustee; the representatives of the union named a trustee—none other than Mr. Lewis—and those two trustees named a third or neutral trustee, as provided by law. The coal mine owners who made the contract delegated to the trustees the sole responsibility for working out a plan by which pensions, death benefits, and other welfare contributions should be made to those entitled to receive them. Mr. Lewis, according to the record, has insisted that all members of his union should become the beneficiaries of this fund. The law clearly requires that only employees of employers parties to the contract are entitled to benefits from this fund. The trustee representing the coal mine owners is on record as saying that Mr. Lewis is demanding benefits for some thirty to forty thousand men who are not entitled to receive such benefits, since they are not employed by the very persons who are paying the bill. Therefore, in utter disregard of the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, Mr. Lewis is demanding that the law be violated.

This is an intricate subject—as are all trust agreements. However, private actuaries were employed to make a study of this matter and upon receipt of their reports Mr. Lewis rejected their conclusions because they did not sustain his contentions. Thereupon, the Social Security Administration of the United States was asked to make an actuarial study and it did so, but Mr. Lewis has completely ignored that study, because in all of its main provisions it sustained the privately made study, and again did not support Mr. Lewis' contentions. This is a matter of record and has been stated by the trustee representing the coal operators—the fund is not sufficient to grant the demands of Mr. Lewis that all miners reaching the age of 60, who have served 20 years, shall be entitled to a pension of $100 per month.

The contract expires on the 30th of June 1948. Over $30,000,000 are now in this fund, and the matter is deadlocked because Mr. Lewis cannot have his way.

The third or neutral trustee has resigned his assignment as of January 1, 1948, declining to accept the full responsibility of this question, and Mr. Lewis has publicly stated that the whole matter could have been satisfactorily concluded had the third or neutral trustee decided with him. This is begging the question simply because any money could be disposed of as long as everyone acceded to Mr. Lewis' wishes.

The record shows that Mr. Lewis has failed to join hands with the trustee representing the operators in the naming of another neutral trustee; consequently the trustee representing the mine owners has gone into the Federal court, in accordance with the provisions of the law, and requested the court to name a third or neutral trustee.

What about the coal-mine owners? I am advised they have repeatedly offered to meet and discuss with Mr. Lewis any grievance he might have whenever he returns the men to work. The contract entered into between the contracting parties clearly provides that any grievance or dispute shall be handled by the contracting parties as it has been the custom for many years not to discuss disputes while the men are out on strike. Lewis now ignores this practice.

This action on the part of one labor leader is giving aid and comfort to those elements in our national life that would weaken and destroy our system of Government. Lewis has defied the Board of Inquiry created by the President under the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. These are all the facts on record. Charges that stand unanswered of record before the President's Board of Inquiry.

I want it made clear that I am as appreciative as any man in this Congress of the benefits John L. Lewis has brought to the coal miners. In fact, it was the deplorable conditions under which these miners lived and worked that made a John L. Lewis possible.

A John L. Lewis who was able to effectuate his just demands against the coal operators is the same John L. Lewis who now defies the legally constituted authority of the Government.

This Congress should understand that chaos faces the Nation if this strike continues many more days. Already transportation services have been curtailed, steel plants are closing down part of their operations; the European relief program is being jeopardized, and I for one do not believe that the great United States

Government is so impotent as not to be able to handle this ruthless labor leader in such a manner as to restore the production of coal.

Lewis, of course, denies that he has called a strike, but when he writes to his membership using violent language, what can they do—they are well trained—but follow their master, and they have without doubt complied with that intention.

Much of the present discussion concerning the current strike has centered around the question of whether or not the national emergency provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 are adequate to handle the United Mine Workers once and for all.

First. We will not know for some time whether or not the Taft-Hartley Act is adequate to deal with the current strike. The House should realize that its application by the present administration leaves much to be desired. The emergency strike provisions were designed to be administered rapidly in order to achieve the objectives of the act. That these provisions have not been administered rapidly is no fault of this House or its Committee on Labor.

Second. This House should realize that the emergency strike provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were designed to delay strike action while reasonable men could arrive at an honest agreement on wages, hours, and other conditions of employment.

The time has come for us to consider legislation designed to drive Lewis into a position where his arbitrary actions are impossible.

It so happened that the original Hartley bill, as passed by this House, contained adequate provision, not only to end the current coal strike, but also to end, once and for all, the threat of John L. Lewis and other labor bosses of his type.

These provisions were redrafted into a new bill, which I introduced yesterday.

In explanation, I want to point out that every provision in this legislation has already been approved by the House of Representatives at the time you passed the original Hartley bill.

These provisions include:

First. A definition of monopolistic strikes.

Second. A provision making such monopolistic strikes unlawful concerted activities.

Third. Amendments to the Clayton Act permitting the Department of Justice to prosecute instigators of monopolistic strikes under the Sherman antitrust law.

I hope the Members of this body will consider this legislation carefully.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper clippings.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain newspaper articles, excerpts, and editorials.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Alabama State Board of Public Welfare.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include letters and telegrams.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER. 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 (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be confined to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman's request is not to exceed 2 hours for general debate?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. CANNON. And if debate can be concluded in less time, less time will be used?

Mr. TABER. That is right; just as little as possible.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

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 H. R. 6055, 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. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries $332,407,000 of direct appropriations for activities of the Government, $14,000,000 for judgments and authorized claims, and $200,000,000 in reductions of appropriations. The appropriations are $66,000,000 below the budget and the reductions in appropriations $50,000,000 above. There is also $150,000,000 for contract authorizations, and several transfers of Navy funds.

I am going to take up first the item in the bill which I believe more Members are interested in than any other, that is, the item relating to the Veterans' Administration, although it is a comparatively small item.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Before the gentleman leaves the over-all figures, I should like to ask, because I do not find them specifically mentioned in the report, what is the total amount of cash appropriations and what is the total amount of contract authorizations carried by the bill?

Mr. TABER. The total amount, including contract authorizations, approximates $500,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. That is the authorizations or the total?

Mr. TABER. Contract authorizations and cash. The cash appropriation is $346,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. What amount in this bill is authorized to be transferred from other funds?

Mr. TABER. There is about $5,000,000. I do not have the exact figure in my head, but it is about that amount.

Mr. CANNON. What amount of receipts which otherwise would be covered into the Treasury are authorized for expenditure by this bill?

Mr. TABER. I do not know that any receipts that would otherwise be covered into the Treasury are involved here. There might be, but I do not have the figures in my head.

Mr. CANNON. What about the Maritime Commission? Is not it authorized to use certain receipts?

Mr. TABER. Yes, it is authorized to use an amount that runs a little over $4,000,000. I am just guessing at it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The amount of receipts authorized to be used is, I think, $17,600,000 for the Maritime Commission.

Mr. CANNON. What amounts in this bill are replacements of cuts made in previous appropriation bills?

Mr. TABER. A very small amount, comparatively: I would say maybe six or seven million dollars over all.

The veterans situation came to a head as a result of a letter that went out to the Office of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the 16th of January reducing the personnel of the Veterans' Administration in their Administrative Section. We had the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] before the committee on some resolutions they had introduced. We had General Gray, the Administrator, and Mr. Clark, Assistant Administrator, and Mr. Moore, the comptroller, and Mr. Sweet, the personnel officer. General Gray told us he felt he did not have the funds to take care of some needed activities which he wished to carry on through the balance of this fiscal year. We went into the matter very thoroughly. Finally he reached the point where he

said that he would like to have authority to put on 3,000 additional personnel. We figured the cost based on that particular type of personnel would be in the neighborhood of $10,500,000 a year. So as to be on the safe side for the 3 months from April 1 to July 1, we made it $3,000,000, so that there would be enough money to cover it. He went to work on it immediately. He has already increased the number of personnel in the Medical Department by 1,200 and the administrative end by 800. He told me he thought that that would take care of the situation.

It was the intention of the committee that the needed personnel for administration should be put back into the Veterans' Administration. It was not the intention, nor do I believe it is the intention of the House, that we carry personnel that are not needed or are not doing the job and rendering useful service. My understanding is that there has been some hesitancy on the part of the Veterans' Administration in putting back contact employees. My attitude, and I think the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations, is that where these contact people are needed to bring about efficient administration that they should be put back or put in whether they are in now or not. I expect that the Administrator will do that. That is what we had in mind when we laid this picture out: that needed things would be done; that the most pressing things would be done. I want to see the claims set-up handled in such a way that the veterans' claims will be taken care of thoroughly and promptly. Where they need contact men, I want to see them put in.

I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has by his last remarks, I believe, conveyed information to the Members on a matter in which they are very generally interested; namely, the contact representatives. My understanding is that included in these $3,000,000 is enough money for the Administrator to keep employed necessary contact representatives in all parts of the country, is that correct?

Mr. TABER. In every part of the country where they are needed. There are a thousand open positions that the Administrator has not so far filled out of the 3,000 that was allowed him.

As I understand it, according to the Legion statement that I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts brought with him, or if not him, then it was the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] it would take 600 to cover what they thought was needed in the contact picture. Maybe I am wrong on that but that is the way I remember it; but in any event there is plenty of money in there to do it.

Mr. McCORMACK. And as far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned they expect the Administrator to keep contact representatives in the various offices and suboffices where they are necessary.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman understand that out of those 8,500 employees of the Veterans' Administration who were let go under this directive to take effect March 31, that these same employees will be rehired or retained?

Mr. TABER. Insofar as the positions that they previously occupied are concerned. I would hardly expect that a man who was engaged in an administrative capacity would be reemployed as a nurse, but insofar as the position he previously occupied is continued, yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, for the reason that only this morning I was advised that they were not going to retain the employees who were discharged but were going to leave the field open and go out throughout the country and hire new ones.

Mr. TABER. That was not my understanding of what should be done.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The figures that I have show that 725 contact positions will be lost or have been lost by the reduction of the VA personnel. I think the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will bear me out in the belief that General Gray does not intend to replace many of those contact men. I think General Gray is very able but he is very new in the Veterans' Administration. I will say I do not think General Gray realizes that the contact man is the first touch that the veteran has with the Veterans' Administration. That man helps him file his claim at once and as the Members of the House know, many of the veterans cannot get any compensation prior to the time that he files his claim.

General Gray has spoken of using itinerant men. How much good is an itinerant man going to be going to many places a hundred miles apart? How much time could he spend on each disabled veteran?

I believe General Gray testified to the Appropriations Committee that he had a thousand jobs now that he could fill, plus the $3,000,000 and plus, I understand, the understanding that the appropriations would give him a certain amount to pay for the terminal leave of these men, then you would have plenty of jobs for these contact men and for a good many other persons.

Can the gentleman give me any idea as to what will happen there?

Mr. TABER. Whatever there is of a requirement for terminal leave for any positions that are carried along where the funds are not available will be provided for in the general 1949 appropriation bill. There is plenty of money now to put back any of the contact men who are needed with this appropriation we are providing now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman from New York that I asked General Gray this morning when he appeared before the Veterans' Affairs Committee the direct question whether if we gave him this $3,000,000 he would reemploy these 3,000 people or what percentage would be put back into contact work. I understood him to say "None," that they were going to use it first for medical, claims, insurance, and rehabilitation.

Many of us on the Veterans' Affairs Committee think that certainly a substantial percentage out of this $3,000,000 should be used to put back contact representatives. Will the gentleman from New York tell me what the feeling of his committee was when they granted this $3,000,000 with reference to contact men?

Mr. TABER. We went into the picture very carefully with General Gray, and General Gray told us that he thought 3,000 would give him the ones that were needed to carry on the job and do it thoroughly. We understand that that would allow him to put back any contact men that were needed and any claims men that were needed. He told us, and we have been advised, that this insurance picture does not head up until after the Supreme Court makes a decision, therefore there is no sense in building up that matter at this time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Quoting from the hearings, General Gray was asked by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]:

> If you were given this $6,000,000 that is called for in the resolution offered by Mr. McCORMACK and Mrs. ROGERS, what would you do with it?
>
> General GRAY. I would put back some of the people who are now being separated.
>
> Mr. KEEFE. How many?
>
> General GRAY. I can only casually estimate that; I would say somewhere around 2,000—2,500—under 3,000.

Further in response to a question from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]:

> So that if Congress appropriated to you $2,500,000 to $3,000,000 to carry these 3,000 personnel, whom it is now contemplated to dismiss from the rolls, will you be able with those 3,000 employees to furnish the essential and necessary and decent services to the veterans?
>
> General GRAY. Yes, sir.

I think it is clear therefore that we have provided all that General Gray feels he needs for essential services to our veterans.

Mr. TABER. That was my understanding, and that was the intention of the committee.

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. PEDEN. In view of the statement made by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], with respect to the testimony of Gen-

eral Gray this morning that he did not intend to replace some of these necessary contact officers, would it be advisable in expressing the true intent of Congress to put into this bill after the word "Administration" the words "including necessary contact officers" in which case we would be assured that the Administrator would follow the intent as you have expressed it that we believe the necessary contact officers should be included in this $3,000,000?

Mr. TABER. I should not object to that amendment, but I think that this discussion which we are presently having on the floor here would be sufficient to call it to the attention of the Administrator that it is the intention of the committee and the Congress to have that done. There seems to be no discordant note here on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I want to make this perfectly clear. I think it is clear already from what the gentleman has said. In the event these contact officers that are necessary are not restored, it is wholly the fault of the Veterans' Administration and not because the veterans committee or the Congress have not given to General Gray the money asked for in this connection, is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is my understanding.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSS. I think we should have this clarified here. This appropriation is being granted for the purpose of reinstating some of the employees that are about to be dismissed because of an order recently issued, is that correct?

Mr. TABER. Well, partly. It is also for the purpose of permitting the Administrator to put to work necessary people in the medical set-up that he feels are especially urgent. He has placed 1,200 additional people at work in that set-up already.

Mr. ROSS. That is what I would like to have clarified. When General Clay was before the committee this morning I asked him if the bulk of this money was not to be used for employing personnel for the medical division, and his answer was "Yes." I asked him further if a number of the employees who have been dismissed and who will be reinstated would be negligible, and he said "Yes."

Mr. TABER. I think perhaps that might be so.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MAHON. The House should fully understand, and the employees of the Veterans' Administration who might have been given notice of separation should fully understand, that General Gray emphasized the fact that he was not willing to say to Congress that he was going to employ the identical people who were threatened with separation from the service. He was against the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], because, he said, it would require him to freeze those particular people in jobs, and he was not willing to do that. He is going to take the $3,000,000, and with that he said he could meet the situation. That is the action of the committee.

Mr. TABER. That is what we understood.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When the testimony was heard by the Veterans' Committee emphasis was placed on the fact that these contact officers that had exceptionally heavy case loads, that were rendering an exceptionally good service should be retained. These veterans live out in the districts and some of them cannot get into the central office without sacrifice of time and money, necessitating even several days off from their work to get the service. Do I understand the committee by granting this additional appropriation means that those contact officers with heavy loads, that were rendering these outstanding services, should be continued?

Mr. TABER. That is my understanding; that where these people are rendering a necessary and effective service, they should be cared for.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In General Gray we recognize a very capable administrator, and I am wondering whether or not he indicated to the committee that there was any reorganization of the Veterans' Administration anticipated at the moment.

Mr. TABER. Well, there are some of these branch offices that he has not made up his mind about. I gathered that he certainly did not intend to increase the number, and that he hoped to reduce the number, and transfer some employees and put them where they were more needed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that some of the employees discharged as of April 1 were probably undesirable employees?

Mr. TABER. That is probably so.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSS. It was stated before the Veterans' Committee that in this personnel reduction no members of the Medical Division would be terminated.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. ROSS. That no members would be terminated under this recent reduction. Now we have additional appropriations being granted and most of the funds will be used for new employees who will be placed in the Medical Division. I just do not think that it should go out to the country that the Congress is now appropriating $2,000,000 for the reemployment of 3,000 of the 8,500 that were terminated, and then not have that done.

Mr. TABER. We did not understand that that was to be the result. As I understand, 1,200 have been put in the medical service and 800 in the administrative service down to this time.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Under the reductions recently announced, certain adjudication boards were eliminated, or the number reduced. Was there any discussion as to whether those adjudication boards would be restored? That is a vital point.

Mr. TABER. As I understand, where they were needed they would be put back.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Was there any explanation given as to where they were needed?

Mr. TABER. We did not go into the details of places that they were to be put, but we were told that where they were needed they would be put back.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Does it appear to the gentleman that it is excusable to take 2 months after a veteran is examined before the adjudication board can act on his claim?

Mr. TABER. It is not.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Well, that has happened in some cases.

Mr. TABER. Well, it should not happen.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. Just to get the matter straight, it is my understanding that the appropriations made here are not made for the purpose of retaining particular people in particular jobs, but are given by the Committee on Appropriations to the Veterans' Administration to do the best possible job of service to the veteran as the Administration sees fit.

Mr. TABER. To do the things that he said were necessary to do to make the job effective.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. As I understand, the Committee on Appropriations has not undertaken to run the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

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 (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2202) entitled "An act to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world," with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; that it disagree to the amendment of the House to the title; that it agree to the conference asked by the House; that it insists upon its amendment and asks a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1948

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world, disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the text of the bill, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

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

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Ohio if he noted in the morning paper that Britain on March 31 had a credit balance of $2,544,000,000? I am wondering whether the gentleman knew that before we passed this bill last night.

Mr. VORYS. We are taking notice of that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. EATON, VORYS, MUNDT, BLOOM, and KEE.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on this bill may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, 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 further consideration of the bill H. R. 6055, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. I was present at the veterans' committee meeting this morning when General Gray appeared and indicated that the greatest need of the Veterans' Administration is for men in the medical service to take care of our disabled veterans. He also pointed out that every veterans' organization had contact men in practically every community in the United States. So I do not want this record to leave the impression that General Gray is injuring the service by seeing that these men get proper medical treatment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take only a few minutes more to run through a little bit of this bill. I am not going to attempt to discuss it fully because the time for general debate will not permit.

We have carried $150,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission contract authorization. We have carried a $75,000,000 increase in the fund for rural electrification. We have carried $143,000,000 for going ahead with the feeding of the occupied territories in Germany, Austria, Japan, and Korea. We have an item here for the construction of a road in Alaska, involving $11,000,000. We have authorized the continuation, without interruption, of the vessel-operating functions of the Maritime Commission to the end of the fiscal year as provided for in the act of February 27, 1948. We have some minor items in the Bureau of Reclamation totaling $1,600,000. We have an item of $10,000,000 for the putting of the new uniform in the Air Force. That will cost us net about $2,500,000, according to the testimony that was given. For rivers and harbors we have a few emergency items totaling about $2,000,000. There are some items for the Post Office Department, due to the increase in the volume of mail. There are also a few items for the State Department.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman made reference to the new uniforms for the Air Force. I have been in consultation with the Air Force on the matter and am hopeful that this is predicated upon a gradual attainment of the new uniform over a period of years, based upon usage and wear of the old uniforms.

Mr. TABER. It is.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, to those who make a hobby of collecting exceptional congressional papers, I recommend the retention of this committee report. In inadequacy, circuitous indirection, and lack of pertinent information, it is probably without parallel in the annals of the Congress.

To begin with there is the most astonishing omission in this report. There is no over-all summary. In every committee report down to the Eightieth Congress you will always find in an introductory paragraph near the beginning of the report a summation which analyzes and digests the bill and the report.

You will look in vain for any such summary, either at the beginning of this report or elsewhere. I do not recall having seen a committee report a bill, especially on an important bill of this kind, where you could not find even the total amount carried by the bill until you put a slide rule and an adding machine on it, and even then be certain as to whether you had not overlooked something.

What is the purpose of a report. The purpose of the report on an appropriation bill is to indicate how much is appropriated, for what purpose it is appropriated, and in what way the funds are to be expended. There is nothing in this report which gives you any such analysis.

For example, you will not find in this report any statement anywhere as to the total amount appropriated and authorized for commitment and expenditure. I do not recall ever having seen a report that did not give that information by way of preface. If you will turn to page 24 of the report and add the totals of title I and title II, you get $346,629,152.23. Apparently, we are to understand that this is the total amount carried in the bill.

But as a matter of fact when you go through the bill item by item and take all the appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations and authority for reallocations, you find that this bill totals something in the neighborhood of $600,000,000. In other words, approximately twice as much as we would be led to believe is carried in the bill if you work out your own arithmetic on a basis of the figures at hand. So that the average Member coming on the floor and picking up the report will be surprised to find, when the whole thing is worked out, that the bill really carries approximately twice what it appears to carry on the face of this report.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is there anything under the rules which would prevent the minority from filing minority views if they do not like the majority report?

Mr. CANNON. I do not recall having seen a minority report on an appropriations bill of this character.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It can be filed, though, can it not?

Mr. CANNON. It is not done. The majority with their staff of experts, and all facilities at hand, are always depended on to write the report.

I was surprised when the chairman said in answer to my question that only about $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 in the bill

is for replacements of cuts made in former bills. If you go through this bill, you find that practically half of the new obligational availability is directly due to the need for restoration of amounts previously claimed as economies. In other words, this committee has ever since the beginning of the Eightieth Congress been operating in many instances on the installment plan. The departments come before the committee and demonstrate the need of definite funds and the committee arbitrarily cuts the appropriation below the amount on which the department can operate, and then tells the country that we have made a saving.

And when the money falls short of the requirements of the department the committee brings in a deficiency or supplemental appropriation which absorbs or more than absorbs the so-called economies.

The last deficiency bill passed here in the House was made up principally of such restitutions. And a large part of this bill is made up of such items.

These appropriations by installments do not save a thin dime. On the contrary, they involve additional and unwarranted cost to the Government. Additional work is shouldered on the Federal agencies and the Congress in the repeated processing of these "come back" estimates. Budget staffs are burdened unnecessarily with additional work and the committees and the two Houses must without profit devote valuable time and energy to these repetitious proceedings. And we end up by restoring the funds arbitrarily denied without supporting factual data.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman point out one such item as that?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. Here, for example, is the amount restored for Government relief in occupied areas. And here is something like $75,000,000 of delayed funds for the postal service. And there is a very substantial amount here for replacement of cuts in the provision for the Atomic Energy Commission. And here is money for the replacement of arbitrary cuts in the replenishment of the working capital of the Government Printing Office. Just these items alone will total something like $295,000,000 instead of the $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 which the gentleman assured us just now would include all replacements for cuts made in previous appropriation bills and heralded to the country as savings and economies.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my chairman, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There was no cut in the contract authorization of atomic energy. Heretofore the cuts in the Post Office were not in the items to any extent that are involved in this deficiency, and there were no substantial cuts in appropriations that have been restored in this bill. There were a few small items, maybe six or seven millions.

Mr. CANNON. Instead of six or seven millions there are in round figures $295,000,000 of restored cuts in the four items alone.

I have here figures supplied by the Budget Bureau which show that the original and supplemental estimates for the Post Office Department were $1,707,473,000. The amount appropriated so far is $1,605,934,000. And the pending supplemental estimate is $141,319,000, of which about $75,000,000 is to replace cuts. The Bureau says about $75,000,000 of the supplemental appropriation requests is considered as needed to offset the cuts by the Congress.

On the Atomic Energy Commission item, the original and supplemental estimates were for a total of $250,000,000. Of this the committee recommended and Congress appropriated $175,000,000, leaving a deficit of $75,000,000. The Budget Bureau says:

> These figures exclude $250,000,000 in contract authorizations requested by the President, approved and enacted. Instead of requesting additional appropriations to make up for the appropriation cuts, a supplemental request for $150,000,000 additional in contract authorizations has been submitted—revision of original request of $200,000,000.

The chairman does not refer to the $2,000,000 cut made in the working capital of the Government Printing Office and here restored in part, or to the $5,000,000 here restored in cuts from the appropriation for Government relief in occupied territory. All these are official figures from the Bureau of the Budget and aggregate roundly $295,000,000, instead of the six or seven mentioned by the chairman.

No attempt is made in the report to summarize the contract authorizations. What is a contract authorization? It is an authorization to enter into a commitment, to create an obligation, which must ultimately be paid by appropriations. That is not economy. The mere fact that you say: "Now, instead of giving you the money I will authorize you to go ahead and make a contract and when the contract eventuates I will pay the money," is in effect an appropriation. And eventually an appropriation must be made to pay it. It is in no sense a saving or an economy.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. As a matter of fact that technicality of contract authorization was conceived under the brilliant leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri when he was chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Now the gentleman is criticizing his own child.

The gentleman is abandoning his own idea and criticizing his own brain child.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. We frequently used the contractual authorization when warranted. But the gentleman cannot point to a single instance in which we tried to represent to the country that we were saving money by deferring the day of reckoning.

By way of recapitulation, Mr. Chairman, the amounts carried in this bill for Government relief of occupied areas, the postal service, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the working capital of the Government Printing Office, and not including other similar but smaller amounts, total approximately $295,000,000 of restored cuts, which at the time were represented as savings. It now turns out they were not savings at all, and we are in this bill restoring them.

Let me emphasize. When you add this $295,000,000 of restored cuts to prior restorations and the corresponding economies claimed at the first session of the Eightieth Congress, you will have dissipated claimed savings to the extent of upward of $1,100,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I shall only speak briefly, but I do want to add a word with reference to the $3,000,000 item which is recommended by your committee for the Veterans' Administration. That is an item in which many of us have been very much interested and which has created considerable concern in New England.

As has been pointed out, General Gray has assured your committee that, with the shifts in personnel which he can make and which he intends to make promptly from places where there may be excess personnel to places where there may be too little personnel, he can, in his opinion, with the money here recommended, provide all essential services for our veterans.

To my friends in New England I may add that General Gray has also testified that New England has been shown to be undermanned, and that the situation there is to be dealt with promptly.

Now, just to keep the record straight, I want to make one or two brief observations.

First, it has been represented in veteran circles that the proposed cut on March 31 was the result of the failure by the Congress to provide sufficient funds for the fiscal year 1948.

That, Mr. Chairman, is not the fact. The proposed cut resulted primarily from the recommendations of the President in respect to the fiscal year 1949, which are substantially below appropriations for the fiscal year 1948, and the determination of the Veterans' Administration to conform to the proposed reduction in personnel, not on July 1, but 3 months in advance of that date, on March 31.

Let me quote in this connection from a statement that I made on the floor of the House on June 17, 1947, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1948, when this appropriation was under consideration:

> I want to emphasize as the report emphasizes that no recommendation made contemplates any cut in any benefit provided by the Congress for our veterans; that no recommendation contemplates any cut in financial assistance to the disabled, to the widowed, to the orphaned, or in medical care for those who are eligible.

And, again:

> The record is clear that the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress have not denied one cent or one employee requested for hospitals.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we all know that the Congress with respect to the fiscal year 1948 in the medical field made available not only every cent that was requested from the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate but in addition thereto the sum of $20,000,000.

Second, it has been represented in veteran circles that the proposed cut on March 31 was due to the fact that representatives of the Veterans' Administration had been told by the Appropriations Committee of the House that they could not come back for a deficiency appropriation.

That, Mr. Chairman, is not the fact. The representatives of the Veterans' Administration who made the assertion have admitted on the record before your committee that they can find nothing in the record to justify that statement.

I have been a member of the committee for many years. I do not recall any such statement being made at any time to the Veterans' Administration or any other agency of this Government.

I know it is unnecessary to state that the Congress will always provide whatever funds are shown to be necessary for the proper care of our veterans.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. In my section of the country there has been a good deal of talk that the reduction in personnel in district offices is done deliberately by the Veterans' Administration in order to build up the few larger offices. Will the gentleman state whether or not that is the opinion of the committee?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I cannot answer the gentleman categorically. I may state, however, that in the New England area it appears that the cut of last summer, which was limited strictly to administrative personnel and which amounted to about 5 percent for the country as a whole, was for unexplained reasons applied by the Deputy Administrator in charge of the New England branch office in such a manner that the regional office in Boston took a cut of about 9 percent and the regional office in Providence a cut of 13.3 percent, as compared with a cut in his own branch office of .04 percent.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. May I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for the statement he has just made before this Committee? I think it was confirmed by the statement of General Gray before the Veterans' Affairs Committee this morning that practically all, if not all, the cuts in personnel were made by him to adjust the Administration to the coming, contemplated cut recommended by the President's budget. I think the gentleman has made that clear. I think the Committee ought to understand it and I hope they do.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The hearings also bear out that fact. I may say to the gentleman that I personally would like to thank him and the chairman and the other members of the subcommittee for the very fine and considerate hearing they gave the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and me when we appeared on our resolutions. Our resolutions called for $6,000,000 in order to put back the personnel displaced by the Veterans' Administration, because we feared these employees might not be taken back if the appropriation was not earmarked in some way and there was a ruthless displacing of splendid personnel.

May I ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman remember that General Gray said:

> The skin back to March 31 was done for the purpose of taking care of the payment of terminal leave and separation, etc.

So, of course, when the Appropriations Committee authorized the payment of $3,000,000, the report goes on to say, the terminal leave will be taken care of in the 1949 budget, so in effect General Gray will have more than the $3,000,000 to spend for personnel. Is not that true?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think my colleague from Massachusetts is correct. The 3,000 personnel who are provided for up to the end of the fiscal year will, of course, either be provided for in the fiscal year 1949 or will be taken care of in that year as to terminal leave.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But there will be no skin back now, so no money would be taken back for that.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding also is that there will be other money that will be put into the 1949 appropriation for terminal leave.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There will have to be additional money for the fiscal year 1949 over and above the President's recommendation either for salaries or for terminal leave.

The effect, Mr. Chairman, of approving the recommendation of your committee and allowing $3,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration is to authorize the retention for the time being on the rolls of the Administration of some 3,000 more persons than are recommended by the President in respect to the fiscal year 1949, and to give General Gray the force which he says is necessary to cover all essential services for our veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CROW. I want to clear up one point the gentleman raised in regard to coming to the Appropriations Committee for a deficiency appropriation. Before our committee this morning Mr. Moore, the budget officer of the Veterans' Administration, testified that the letter of instructions came from the executive department to live within that budget and not ask for a deficiency appropriation. It did not come from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That of course is an entirely different thing from the charge that has been made that the instructions came from the committee.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I wonder if the gentleman would assure me about one item on page 11 of the bill at line 19 calling for the appropriation of $35,000 for the Department of the Interior. Will that make possible the continuation of the publication of the fish marketing reports?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am aware of the great interest of the gentleman from Connecticut in that item. I am glad to assure him that the sum recommended here is considered adequate to continue the work throughout the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Does that include the distribution and mailing of that marketing service which has meant so much to the fishing industry and to the fishermen generally?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not familiar with all the details of the work. I understand, however, that provision is made for carrying on the normal work of the activity during the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is what I understood the Committee on Appropriations really did consider. I know and we all know in the New England area of the attention that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has given to veterans' problems in that area, and that he is fully conversant with the underlying causes of complaints that have been made, particularly in respect to the closing up of contact offices out in the districts, which had exceptionally heavy case loads. That was the basis of my complaints and the complaints of many others of my colleagues in the Massachusetts area. It seemed to be the intention to load up the central office in Boston with personnel at the expense of the so-called contact offices out in the districts. Under the provisions of this bill with the $3,000,000 appropriation, the Veterans' Administration will be permitted, where it is justified, to maintain contact offices that carry heavy case loads if they find it is in the interest of the veterans to do that.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes. We cannot, of course, run the Veterans' Administration from the floor of Congress. We have given General Gray the amount of money that he says he needs for all essential services, and he can apply the funds in the manner in which the gentleman suggests or in any other

way that he sees fit to meet the essential needs of the veterans throughout the country.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. So you are in full agreement with the statement of the gentleman from New York, Chairman TABER, of the Committee on Appropriations, that it is the intention where the services are essential in these contact offices out in the districts which are nearer to the veterans that consideration should be given to the maintenance of such offices under this appropriation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am, wherever those services are essential.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I note on page 6 of the committee report with reference to the Department of the Interior, Bonneville Power Administration, that an allowance of $625,000 was made plus the contract authorization of $1,475,000. Is that amount sufficient in the gentleman's opinion to permit the Bonneville Power Administration to carry forward its program for the generation and transmission of hydroelectric power which is so essential now in our war activities and preparation for war in view of the critical situation that confronts us?

Mr. TABER. Whatever the budget estimates were, they were allowed.

Mr. ANGELL. The budget estimate was $725,000.

Mr. TABER. We carry that money for the purpose of going ahead and completing the power lines so that certain territory could be served.

Mr. ANGELL. In other words, so that the full utilization of the power to be generated at Grand Coulee will be made available?

Mr. TABER. I do not know about the full utilization, but that amount was carried so that certain territory could be served.

Mr. ANGELL. I mean full utilization of power presently being produced and to be made available in the near future.

I am glad the committee has made this essential appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], a member of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of the House like to have the feeling at this critical time in the history of our world that we are providing adequate funds for the Atomic Energy Commission. Yesterday we authorized a tremendous program for relief to Europe hoping that we might help free nations to retain their freedom and join with us in preserving the peace and security of the world. Certainly while we are undertaking indirectly to help ourselves by helping others, we should undertake directly to help our own country become more secure. Unfortunately last year requests for the atomic program, that is the Budget estimates for the atomic program, were reduced. But the bill now before us provides $150,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. The members of the Commission explained in detail the need for the money and they indicated no desire for funds at this time except the $150,000,000 provided in this bill in the form of a contract authorization. I might say that I feel the Congress has the right to feel that a real aggressive program is being carried out in the atomic military program.

The Members of the House have indicated considerable interest in the $3,000,000 provided for the Veterans' Administration. This man, General Gray, the new Director of the Veterans' Administration, who appeared before the Deficiency Subcommittee for the first time insofar as I know, made a good impression; at any rate, he made a good impression upon me. He seems to be a man who deals forthrightly and fairly. He seems to have an alert mind and a broad background of experience, and I am hoping that he will be able to do a good job in administering this gigantic program over which he now has jurisdiction. He said that he needed the $3,000,000, and this Congress is, of course, in this bill providing the $3,000,000 which he requested, and he has wide latitude in the use of those funds in the employment of additional personnel. I reassert my own interest in seeing that the needs of the veterans of the Nation are adequately met.

The Voice of America program came in for a considerable reduction. The report will show that something over $5,000,000 was requested but only a portion of that amount was provided by the committee. It is my sincere conviction that the Voice of America program up to date has not been very well administered, and I joined others on the subcommittee in some very pointed criticism of some of the work that has recently been done by the Voice of America program. We had access to some programs which have been broadcast which we thought were utterly ridiculous and could serve no useful purpose. It is only fair, however, to say that the Congress has provided the Information Service in the State Department with inadequate funds in the past—has denied the State Department the funds it has previously requested.

I regret to say that it is perfectly apparent that as propagandists our Government is not very expert; we are rank amateurs. But at a time when communism is threatening to engulf a large portion of the world and threatens the liberties of all free governments, it is certainly mandatory that we try to meet that challenge, and preserve our liberties. It is the duty and function of the Voice of America to help make known to the world the true attitude of our Nation and our desire for peace among all peoples. Personally, I would like to have seen the full request of the President for the Voice of America carried in this bill. Members will realize that when we are appropriating many billions for foreign relief and many billions for our own domestic national defense program that the few millions of dollars involved in the Voice of America program can easily be justified. We must do a bigger and better job if the best interests of the Nation are to be served.

The Geological Survey, which has the responsibility of making continuous and intensive studies of the underground and surface waters of the Nation was denied by $150,000 the amount of money requested. This, I think, was a mistake on the part of the committee, because there is hardly a county, city, or community in America that does not have a water problem of some kind, ground water or surface water problem, and I personally feel that the full amount of $635,000 should have been approved rather than the $450,000 which is provided for in the bill.

Some of the expenditures provided for in this bill do not contribute to the overall worth of the Nation. That cannot be said, however, of the budget request of $175,000,000 for the REA that was slashed to only $75,000,000 which, in my judgment, was a serious mistake. The full $175,000,000 should have been provided in fairness to those who are interested in the REA program. It should be said that REA officials have said they cannot commit or spend the entire $175,000,000 prior to July 1 of this year, but they can obligate a considerable portion of that amount and they can carry the remaining sums over into the next year, and in this year and next year we will have the most ambitious REA program which has ever been undertaken in the history of the Nation. Every time we build an REA line and bring electricity to a rural home we are enriching the Nation, increasing our productive capacity, and contributing to the health and happiness of the people. What is more, there is no out-of-pocket cost to the taxpayer. Rather it is a gain to the taxpayer.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. With applications now pending and the ones that will come in during the next fiscal year, they will exceed the entire amount of this $175,000,000 plus the $400,000,000 provided for next year. If the money is not spent, it will not be used and every dollar that is spent will come back with interest. So you do not even run a chance of losing a dollar by this appropriation.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct that these funds cannot be lost. There is no charge to the Treasury if the funds are not expended and at a time when our national commitments and obligations are so heavy there is every reason why we should improve our own productive capacity, our own workshop, so to speak, if we are to meet the unforeseen problems of the future.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VURSELL. I would like to get this REA matter straightened out in my own mind. I read in the RECORD in connection with previous appropriations for the REA that it asked the Budget last December for $175,000,000, according to their own testimony given before your committee or some committee at a previous hearing. The Bureau of the Budget would not allow that request. Then a few days ago in the Agricultural appropriation bill the committee gave them $100,000,000 more than they had requested.

Mr. MAHON. That was for the fiscal year 1949 which will begin July 1, making a total of $400,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. VURSELL. In other words, they were given by this committee $100,000,000 more than the administration was willing for them to have?

Mr. MAHON. Than the administration requested for the next fiscal year.

Mr. VURSELL. More than they would O. K. at that particular time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas five additional minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. There are $75,000,000 written into this bill which makes up the $175,000,000. Now you will have about $475,000,000, as I understand it, for the coming year, is that right?

Mr. MAHON. Well, no. You will have for the coming year $400,000,000 and according to this bill $75,000,000 for the remainder of this year ending on June 30, 1948.

Mr. VURSELL. You will have $475,000,000. Is it not a fact they have been able to extend REA as fast as they could get labor and material today?

Mr. MAHON. No; that is not the precise fact. These orders for REA equipment must be placed. They have got to compete with our domestic orders for materials and also with foreign demands. If the farmer does not get into the waiting line for these materials he never gets them. There is a period of waiting between the time these funds are obligated and they actually get the material. The hearings show very clearly that the materials are becoming much more accessible than they have heretofore been. The hearings will show that the Congress appropriated for this fiscal year $225,000,000. The REA has dribbled this money along throughout the fiscal year in order not to run short of funds, feeling they were acting under the mandate of Congress. They could have wisely expended or obligated all of this money. After all, this is but a loan which is later repaid the Treasury. The REA held back the program. It had to. They kept down the applications and they denied people the REA services which the people were seeking to get because they wanted to make this money last throughout the entire year. They could have obligated it much earlier.

Mr. VURSELL. I realize they could have obligated probably more money but it is still a debatable question whether they could have gotten the material and the labor. Taking into consideration this appropriation which will bring the backlog up to something like $450,000,000 and taking into consideration that we are likely to have an increase in shortage of material by reason of the fact that we voted for the Marshall plan, the chances are in the coming 12 months you will not be able to get anywhere near the material for which you have the money on account of the shortage that is bound to follow by the shipping of steel, electrical equipment, and everything else that is going out of this country under the mandate of the Congress which yesterday passed the so-called Marshall plan.

Mr. MAHON. That is all the more reason why we should appropriate now the $175,000,000 in order that the different REA cooperatives out through rural America may get these funds, may enter into contracts for the purchase of equipment so that their requests for equipment may have priority over others which may come from industry both in this country and elsewhere. So the passage of the Marshall plan is all the more reason why those who want to help the farmer get electricity should vote for this additional appropriation of $175,000,000 for this program.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In answer to the gentleman from Illinois, and his observations made a moment ago, let me say that about a month ago I was back in the district which I have the honor to represent and attended a meeting of a cooperative made up of three counties in my district, and I found these facts: There were 4,000 farmers who had applications in for REA—as many applicants that could not be served as there were users in that cooperative.

In other words, these men had had these applications on file for months waiting and waiting for this service, which every farmer is entitled to, and this $175,000,000 will, as the gentleman says, permit the cooperatives to make contracts and allocations and make it possible for these farmers, after a 6- or 12-month wait, to get the service which they are entitled to. This is not an expenditure but a loan to solvent borrowers which will be repaid to the Government with interest. I do hope we adopt the proposed amendment and make life for the people on many of our farms a little brighter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. I will say to the gentleman that many people have made applications and made their deposits for REA service not only twelve months ago, but several years ago. By reason of the war and shortages of material they have waited a long, long time, and therefore I feel that Congress ought to embark upon a real program to take electricity to the farm homes of America, particularly since it does not cost the taxpayers any money. I am not going to pretend to economize by denying electricity to the farm homes of the Nation.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WORLEY. I would like to say to the gentleman that I agree with the views he expresses on the REA program. I intend to support the amendment that will be offered to increase the amount for REA. I understand such an amendment will be offered; will it not?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. WORLEY. While REA is of great importance, another particularly important item during these troubled times is the amount appropriated for the Atomic Energy Commission. Did the gentleman say that was increased by $150,000,000?

Mr. MAHON. One hundred and fifty million dollars contract authorization, which will later be followed by an actual appropriation.

Mr. WORLEY. Then all the money that has been requested for that purpose has been provided for?

Mr. MAHON. All the money presently requested has been appropriated or provided for in contract authorization.

Mr. WORLEY. Can the gentleman assure the House that the atomic energy program is moving forward fast enough to meet any international emergency?

Mr. MAHON. It is my opinion based upon the information given our committee that the program is moving along in a satisfactory manner. Of course, the whole matter is desperately important to our security.

I thank the gentleman for his comments. I know of his interest in that program and his aggressive support of REA and atomic energy development.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman remember the original estimates set up for REA for the present fiscal year?

Mr. MAHON. I do not have the figure. We appropriated $225,000,000 this year for the REA. What the budget estimate was, I do not recall. But, the budget estimate now before us is $175,000,000, and this bill provides only $75,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

THE FARMER—WHAT WE HAVE DONE FOR HIM AND WHAT MORE CAN BE DONE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of the Budget has recommended that we appropriate $175,000,000 in order to keep the REA program moving from now until July 1. I know something about that budget request from its inception.

I also know that from my State alone there are applications on file at REA for $17,737,000 from people who want electricity and who are able to pay for it. I know the REA does not have enough money for the remainder of this fiscal year to take care of these people, and I know that every cent of the amount we will appropriate here today will be applied for before the fiscal year 1948 is over, and every cent of the $400,000,000 that we appropriated in the regular agricultural appropriation bill for 1949 will be needed to take care of the requests that will normally arise after July 1.

The budget asked us for $300,000,000 for 1949. We very wisely added $100,000,000 to that. The budget request we are now considering asked for $175,000,000 for use between now and July 1. You cut $100,000,000 off that. In the final analysis, you have added exactly nothing to the President's estimate.

I urge that this $100,000,000 be restored so that what we did for the rural people

2 weeks ago will not be canceled by what we do to them today.

KNEW BUDGET ESTIMATE FROM ITS INCEPTION

When REA began to slow up in approving loan applications from my people and yours, I took this matter up with Mr. Wickard. He said at that time that REA could use for the remainder of this year $175,000,000 without receiving another application that was not already on file. I then went to the Secretary of Agriculture, who agreed to send over this budget estimate; and, after I talked with officials of the budget, the estimate did come over for this $175,000,000. That is why I said earlier that I know something of this item from its inception.

I can well remember when the bill to authorize rural electrification was before this body. I handled it. I reported it from the committee. It passed the Senate. I passed it through the House. Good men, sensible men, men who wanted to help the farmers, got on this floor—and I reviewed the record the other day and read their speeches—and some said, "This money is all going to be wasted. These farmers will take electricity, and when the bill comes around they will take it out."

TEXAS FARMS HAVE KEPT ELECTRICITY

If there is one farm in the State of Texas that ever had rural electrification that has taken it out, I know nothing about it. Most of the cooperatives are ahead on their payments. We are lending this money to these farm cooperatives, and this money that is going out of the Treasury is coming back with interest. It is not an expense to the Government. It is actually an investment that shows a current profit.

In my State, to show you what has been done, in 1936 fewer than 3 percent of the farm homes were electrified. Those few homes were either just out of the city limits or they were the homes of rich men. Of course, we had practically a hiatus of construction during the war because you could not get copper wire and you could not get transformers and you could not get the poles. But even though practically nothing was done during the war years, today more than 53 percent of the farm homes in all of the State of Texas have the comforts and conveniences of rural electrification.

MUST HAVE ELECTRICITY AND ALL-WEATHER ROADS

I want to point out another thing. The young people of rural America are not going to stay on the farms and raise the food we need to eat and the fiber we need for our clothing unless they have two things. One is the comforts and conveniences of electricity and the other is all-weather roads. We might just as well face the music. If we are to develop this country so that we can feed ourselves and have some surplus left over to trade with the other countries of the world in exchange for their surplus products, we must have these two comforts and conveniences—these two necessities for our farm homes.

FARM BOY DOESN'T FORGET

A boy who is born and raised on the farm may forget many things as he grows older—he may forget what he learns in school, some of his business sense may slip his mind—but he never forgets the farm.

Nobody knows better than I how true that is.

Through the years I have been privileged to serve as Representative of the Fourth District of Texas I have never forgotten that I am just a farm boy.

The teachings of the farm and the farmers' understanding of the wonders of the soil, the goodness of people, and the great power of prayer and humility—those things have been my guiding principles in all that I have done on down through life.

As I see the picture of the world today, America needs to turn back to the farm. If that could come to pass, I know this country would get closer to God. Many of the weeds in our thinking would be killed off if that happened. The roots of democracy do not grow deep in the slums of the big cities, through the mud of inadequate farm roads, or in the darkness of unelectrified homes.

Men of the soil brought this free land of ours into being, because as farmers, they understood what freedom means. Whenever our precious heritage is in peril, you can count on men of the soil being the first to defend it.

These things must be emphasized in order to point out just how important the farmer is. He is the cornerstone of our freedom in this country and in the world. Giving him the tools and assistance he needs to produce an ever-increasing supply of food is every bit as important as supplying guns and shells to our soldiers.

We must not make the farmer the scapegoat of political promisers by abolishing or throttling our farm programs. This is no time for that sort of foolish and false economy.

PROMISES DO NOT REPLACE RAIN

It is not my practice to engage in promising that I will do this or I will do that in Washington. I have followed that policy throughout my service in public office because promises do not replace rain; promises do not support the price of cotton; promises do not top farm-to-market roads, and promises do not turn on electricity in farm homes.

Let us examine just what the major problems of our farmers are. What are the basic farm problems in my district and all across the land?

The fundamental problem is conservation of the soil. After all, the soil is the farm. If the soil washes away or blows away or is worn out, the farm is useless. No activity of our Government is more important than soil conservation.

Soil may be wonderfully rich, prices may be high, but what does all this matter if there are no roads to get the farmer and his family into town and to the market?

COTTON FARMERS' MONEY DEPENDS ON CONDITIONS AROUND THE GLOBE

Finally, of course, there is the problem of markets abroad for the food our farmers produce. Sometimes the ports of Europe and Asia seem far removed from north Texas, but actually the money a Texas cotton farmer carries in his pocket may depend upon conditions halfway around the globe.

Now that is just a hasty review of the problems that are most important for the farmers of the country at present. What have we done, and what are we now doing to solve them?

FARMERS ARE AS POOR AS THE SOIL THEY LIVE ON

First, on soil conservation.

When I was growing up in the rich black land and fertile sandy loam country around home, soil conservation was practically unheard of. So the land was plowed up and down the slope; the timber was cut; the streams were undammed for many years, and the results were just as sure as rain.

Our rich treasure of topsoil began washing away from the fields, leaving gullies and ditches across the plowed ground, and making some areas unfit for use. If that had continued, my district—and a goodly portion of the entire United States—would today be covered with empty ghost towns.

But since I came to Congress, I have been privileged to work with many fine men in the House to secure steadily increasing appropriations for the work of soil conservation. It has been during the history of this work that the dust storms appeared and then were mastered by soil-conservation experts. Yes; and you see fewer pastures and fields gutted down to rock bottom with ditches now. I helped create the Soil Conservation Service. I voted for the first money to put it in operation. I have continued to vote for the funds needed to keep that work going.

FARMERS ARE DEPENDENT ON THE PRICE OF WHAT THEY GROW

Now, second, let us consider the matter of prices.

Congress and Members of this body cannot crook a finger and command prices to come up, but Congress has used its power to say that prices shall not drop below a certain point.

The farm price-support program is certainly one of the most sound and beneficial activites of the Government. The farmers, who take a big gamble every time they plant a crop, deserve this stabilizer—this minimum wage for farmers.

There is talk about cutting the price support for cotton to 52 percent of parity. That is the floor set for basic commodities by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1938. Prior to the passage of this act our Government had never acknowledged any responsibility for the welfare of the farmer. It set a new standard of Government assistance to those who feed and clothe our people. I helped to develop that policy. I have helped to raise that floor, until today the price of cotton is supported at 92½ percent of parity, and the Government has not only helped our farmers but has made nearly a quarter of a billion dollars doing it. Other farm prices are also supported against disastrously low figures that would spell ruin to our farmers, then ruin to our whole economy. I do not propose to sit idly by and see it destroyed or weakened by those who never knew what it is to drag a cotton sack.

FARMERS SHOULD NOT BE FORCED TO LIVE ALONE

Farmers know that "no man liveth to himself alone." It makes no difference how far the farmer lives from the courthouse, from the railroad, from the bright lights, he and his family have the same desire to be able to see and visit these developments of civilization—and the same right—as those who live in cities. To do this the farmer must have roads—not highways, desirable as they are—but just plain roads over which he can travel every day in the year. If he does not have such roads, he is likely to move to town. If he does so, he becomes a competitor of those already there. Is it not better for the city dweller to help that farmer and that farmer's family stay on farms where they will be consumers of the products of industry and labor? Will not that farmer and his family be happier on the farm and be worth more to the country if he has a road which will enable them to participate in the civic life of the community and in the business life of the trade center?

Recently we passed a bill extending for 3 years more this highway program. In 1944 when postwar highway building legislation came before Congress, I told the Members that at least 30 percent of that money should be set aside for farm-to-market roads. The Members agreed, and now we can have nearly 1 mile of farm-to-market road built for every 2 miles of highways if the States will appropriate money to match the Federal funds. I expect to continue to ask for funds for these rural roads.

FARMERS DEPEND ON REA

Fourth, the rural electrification question—the question involved in this bill.

When I came to Washington as a Congressman, I could not have imagined what the current of electricity would do to the rural areas of this land—bring them to life, give them new prosperity and new hope, and add all the luxury of city life to rural areas.

I am very proud that I sponsored the legislation in Congress that started the rural-electrification program in this Nation.

It is now evident to every eye what electricity has done for the homes in rural areas all across the land. Now our rural areas can compete with the urban areas as never before. A great new era of wealth, comfort, and happiness has been made possible by electric current.

I am proud that the Fourth District of Texas has been among the leaders in expanding the lines of the REA cooperatives and making current available throughout the district. I know that each family with electricity enjoys a better life because of it.

FARMER'S INCOME RELATED TO WORLD TRADE

And, finally, we come to the question of how the world situation affects the farmer.

Some would have you believe that Texas farmers are not bothered about the matter of exports, but exports may make them or break any man in north Texas. I shall make a brief illustration of one case I have in mind.

PRICE OF COTTON KEPT HIGH

After World War II, the Department of Agriculture and the Army engaged in a big program of disposal of millions of bales of surplus cotton abroad throughout the war-torn countries.

I went to see the Agriculture Secretary shortly before that was done and discussed it with him. I felt that getting rid of the surplus at once was the wisest thing to do and would mean much to the American cotton farmer.

The Secretary agreed and the order was issued. Those exports kept the price of cotton high and prevented a sudden and unfortunate drop right at the end of the war. If we are to maintain the markets for our cotton, we must maintain our exports. I am constantly fighting to maintain these conditions which are so vital to the sale of the products of Texas farms.

I have reviewed these actions, not with any desire for personal acclaim, but rather to point out the fight some of us have carried on for the farmers of the entire Nation.

In the legislative processes of the United States, miracles are not wrought overnight. We have only begun. Appropriating the $175,000,000 today will be one step forward.

Promises are easy things to bestow and easy to give away. It has been my observation that promises do not get the job done alone—work and experience are necessary.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I was delighted to hear the remarks of the two distinguished gentlemen from Texas [Mr. MAHON and Mr. RAYBURN] supporting this additional appropriation of $175,000,000 for rural electrification for the balance of this fiscal year.

I was surprised to hear my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] raise the partisan issue, because, so far as I am concerned, and so far as the House is concerned, I have never observed any partisan fight on the rural electrification issue.

I remember in 1938 when I put through the amendment for the first $100,000,000 for rural electrification, some men on the other side of the aisle, I can mention some of the names now: Mr. Treadway, of Massachusetts; Mr. Rich, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Knutson; Mr. Woodruff; Mr. Michener; Mr. Reed of New York, and others, joined me on the teller vote, and we only won by six majority.

That gave rural electrification a real start, doing more for the American farmers than anything else that Congress has ever attempted.

During most of the calendar year 1947 applications were received at the rate of $24,000,000 a year. The record shows, however, that for the first 11 weeks of 1948 they were coming in at the rate of eight and one-third million dollars a week. If this rate continues during the remainder of the fiscal year 1948 and throughout 1949, we will have applications for $850,000,000. We only have $50,000,000 carried over. So it will take the full $800,000,000—the $400,000,000 provided for next year, the $225,000,000 already appropriated for the present fiscal year, and the $175,000,000 we are asking for in this amendment.

If the Senate approves the $400,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949 which the House has passed, and if the budget's request for this $175,000,000 supplemental for the remainder of the year is appropriated, as I said, the combined total will amount to $800,000,000 for the expansion of this great rural electrification program. We will have, as I said, $850,000,000 worth of applications at the present rate, and with the $50,000,000 on hand, when that is expended, we will need $800,000,000 for the balance of this year and for the next fiscal year.

I have broken down the applications now pending in the Rural Electrification Administration, and I call the attention of my distinguished friend from Illinois to the fact that there are applications pending from the State of Illinois for $9,387,000; from the State of Kansas applications are pending amounting to $13,523,000; from Iowa, $13,781,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I wish to ask the gentleman from Mississippi what it costs for the administration of this act.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not have the exact figures here. Probably some of the other members of the committee can provide them.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I can well understand that there might be $9,000,000 in the third or fourth largest State in the Union, but the point I want to bring out in fairness is that many of these obligations are 4 and 5 years old and could not be serviced because of lack of materials during the war. May I say this—that there is no one more interested in taking care of the people of Illinois than I am.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to assure the gentleman from Illinois that in this respect I am more than willing to help him. This is not a local issue with me at all.

There should be a mail box in front of every farmhouse in America, and I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] that there should be an all-weather road to every farmhouse; but above all, there should be a power line to every farmhouse in America.

When I began this fight back in 1934, 90 percent of the farms of Germany were electrified, 90 percent of the farms of Japan were electrified, 94 percent of the farms of France and of Italy were electrified, 65 percent of the farms of New Zealand, a new and sparsely settled country, were electrified. In this country we had only 10.9 percent of our farms electrified. Today we have more than 60 percent of our farms in this country electrified. Let us make it 100 percent.

Let me remind you again that this money all comes back with interest. You are not giving these farmers anything. One reason they cannot get materials allotted is that they are not sure of the money with which to pay for them. This money will add billions of dollars to the wealth of this Nation, and, as I said, it will not cost this Government a dime. Every dollar of it will come back with interest.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Would the gentleman care to make an observation as to where the washing machines, the radios, the milking machines, the electrical equipment that goes into these farm homes comes from?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, they are manufactured in the territory of our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] and in New York and the Eastern States.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has mentioned the increase in value of our farms through being electrified. What would the gentleman say about the increased production on our farms when the farm is electrified?

Mr. RANKIN. It has been tremendous. It has taken to the farmer everything we have in the city except the noise and city taxes.

It has done more to raise the standard of living on the American farm than anything else that has ever been undertaken.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Is it not true that had the farms of America been electrified during the critical times through which we have gone, their productive capacity would have been far greater than what it was?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And if in future years we could electrify the farms and see that they got the equipment they need it would add immeasurably to national defense.

Mr. RANKIN. Absolutely. I cannot understand why anybody would oppose this program. They talk about $400,000,000 for next year. At the rate we are going I have shown you that we will have $850,000,000 of applications. When the Bureau of the Budget realized this they added this $175,000,000 to the $225,000,000 already provided, which will bring this up to $800,000,000, every dollar of which will be used legitimately in improving the conditions of farm life.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman about the soundness of the investment in this program. I can remember years ago when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] introduced the bill which brought about the REA program in the House and we Democrats from the city recognized the full impact favorably upon our national economy as well as the happiness it would bring to hundreds of thousands of our fine farmers and their families, increasing their production and benefiting our national economy, and we Democrats from the city have always supported it.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I have supported the development of all the water power in this country. When I came to Congress we were using 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. That was in 1921. Today we are using five and a half times that amount. We have 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power a year now going to waste. I am in favor of developing all of it, and providing it to the American people at the lowest possible rate.

Here is a list of applications for loans by States. The 12 States which have in the largest total applications at this time are: Missouri, with $30,437,000; North Dakota, $22,490,000; Texas, $17,739,500; Nebraska, $18,579,000; Georgia, $14,790,000; South Dakota, $14,260,000; Iowa, $13,781,000; Kansas, $13,523,000; South Carolina, $11,795,000; Minnesota, $11,753,000; Kentucky, $11,147,000; and Florida, $10,250,000.

The complete list follows:

ALABAMA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $5,752,000.

ARIZONA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $1,076,000.

ARKANSAS

The applications now pending from that State amount to $4,785,000.

CALIFORNIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $130,000.

COLORADO

The applications now pending from that State amount to $5,698,000.

CONNECTICUT

The applications now pending from that State amount to zero.

DELAWARE

The applications now pending from that State amount to $150,000.

FLORIDA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $10,250,000.

GEORGIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $14,790,000.

IDAHO

The applications now pending from that State amount to $1,310,000.

ILLINOIS

The applications now pending from that State amount to $9,387,000.

INDIANA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $2,130,000.

IOWA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $13,781,000.

KANSAS

The applications now pending from that State amount to $13,523,000.

KENTUCKY

The applications now pending from that State amount to $11,147,000.

LOUISIANA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $2,591,000.

MAINE

The applications now pending from that State amount to $146,000.

MARYLAND

The applications now pending from that State amount to $800,000.

MASSACHUSETTS

The applications now pending from that State amount to zero.

MICHIGAN

The applications now pending from that State amount to $2,456,000.

MINNESOTA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $11,753,000.

MISSISSIPPI

The applications now pending from that State amount to $6,730,000.

MISSOURI

The applications now pending from that State amount to $30,437,000.

MONTANA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $8,462,000.

NEBRASKA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $18,597,000.

NEVADA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $80,000.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

The applications now pending from that State amount to $3,469,000.

NEW JERSEY

The applications now pending from that State amount to $140,000.

NEW MEXICO

The applications now pending from that State amount to $1,510,000.

NEW YORK

The applications now pending from that State amount to $127,000.

NORTH CAROLINA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $4,112,000.

NORTH DAKOTA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $22,490,000.

OHIO

The applications now pending from that State amount to $3,276,000.

OKLAHOMA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $9,407,000.

OREGON

The applications now pending from that State amount to $1,740,000.

PENNSYLVANIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $2,170,000.

RHODE ISLAND

The applications now pending from that State amount to zero.

SOUTH CAROLINA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $11,795,000.

SOUTH DAKOTA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $14,260,000.

TENNESSEE

The applications now pending from that State amount to $10,055,000.

TEXAS

The applications now pending from that State amount to $17,739,500.

UTAH

The applications now pending from that State amount to $590,000.

VERMONT

The applications now pending from that State amount to $450,000.

VIRGINIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $4,485,000.

WASHINGTON

The applications now pending from that State amount to $2,195,000.

WEST VIRGINIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $53,000.

WISCONSIN

The applications now pending from that State amount to $6,059,000.

WYOMING

The applications now pending from that State amount to $2,550,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to propound a question to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I notice on page 19, lines 3, 4, 5, and 6, of the bill an appropriation of $143,000,000 for government and relief in occupied areas. It appears from the hearings that the request was for $150,000,000 and in the committee report, page 9, it is stated that those in charge of the program advised the committee that a saving of $7,000,000 can be had in civilian-employee pay and travel and so forth. The committee is therefore giving the War Department the full amount requested for relief in occupied areas?

Mr. TABER. For food; yes, sir.

Mr. PACE. Inasmuch as the committee has allowed the full amount requested, the Department will be expected to substantially follow the justification and the items set out in the hearings under this $150,000,000?

Mr. TABER. That is my understanding.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I was gratified and relieved at the assurances given by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] that the $3,000,000 contained in this deficiency bill would enable the Veterans' Administration to restore the essential services that have been recently curtailed, and I desire to express my appreciation to the committee for their willingness to provide these funds.

I represent a State that has no veterans hospital within its borders, and a district that has had three contact offices closed within the last few weeks. Nashua, the second largest city in the State; Concord, the State capitol; and Claremont; all in my district, have lost their offices.

I met with other members of the New England delegation on March 8 to consider this serious situation and on March 11 was one of a committee which interviewed the President of the United States, urging him to remove the restrictions which prevented the sending up a request to the Committee on Appropriations. I have conferred with the Veterans' Administration within the last 24 hours and have been informed that this deficiency appropriation will permit the restoration of all essential services. I have every confidence, therefore, that the situation in my district, as well as the districts of other members here who have suffered the most heavily, will be taken care of immediately, and I take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the attitude of the Administrator in regard to this matter.

I am positive that we are all in accord on one thing, and that is that whatever our decision may be as to what can be done for our veterans who enjoy physical health, there is one place in which we will not economize and that is in the prompt service and efficient care of the injured and disabled veterans. I shall continue to press this point in behalf of those whom I represent.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee a question. He will recall that earlier in the year on an appropriation bill the chairman handled I presented a limitation amendment in connection with proposed conversions to oil from coal or new installations of oil-burning equipment in the appropriation bill then pending. The chairman and the committee were good enough to accept it at that time.

Subsequently, it seemed to me it would be more advisable to take the matter up with each subcommittee and inquire during debate if it was the intention of the committee that no part of the appropriation shall be used for those purposes unless it can be clearly demonstrated that it is absolutely essential. I have asked this question of the chairman informally. I understand that is the purpose and intention of the committee handling this particular appropriation bill. Am I right?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to request that the Appropriations Committee and this body give further consideration to the $700,000 item which was eliminated from the Bureau of the Budget's request for maintenance and operation of schools. I refer specifically to page 6 of this bill, lines 16–24. You will note that the committee has recommended for the Federal Works Agency, Bureau of Community Facilities, an additional amount for maintenance and operation of schools to the extent of $1,300,000. The request of the Bureau of the Budget for this purpose was for $2,000,000. At this point I would like to call your attention to page 3 of the committee's report. It states, in discussing this action regarding the Federal Works Agency, that the committee believes expenditures should be limited to deficits incurred during the current year rather than reimbursements for deficits incurred for prior years. The committee accordingly eliminated $700,000, which supposedly was the amount earmarked for meeting 1946–47 school deficits. I would like to point out, however, that the Federal Works Agency requested only $669,181 to reduce the 1946–47 school deficits. In cutting the request by $700,000, then, the committee has actually eliminated $30,819 needed to meet 1947–48 school deficits. The Congress should, therefore, consider restoring this $30,819 if we are to meet the anticipated 1947–48 deficits. In fact, I might add that the deficits originally anticipated for 1947–48 have been exceeded because of the severe winter in sections of the country where the schools concerned are located.

I also wish to briefly call the attention of the Members of the House to the importance of meeting these 1946–47 deficits. It was the intent and purpose of the Lanham Act and the Landis Act which succeeded it to meet the deficits incurred by the schools which qualified for assistance under these measures. The fact that sufficient appropriations were not available in 1946–47 to make it possible for these schools to enter the 1947–48 year free of deficit is not the fault of the schools involved. These deficits are not just figures for academic discussion, they are actual bills which must be met. During the hearings of the committee some question was raised as to the legality of appropriating funds this year to meet the deficits of 1946–47. That matter was adequately settled by Mr. Frank L. Yates, Acting Comptroller General of the United States. Mr. Yates, in a letter to the Federal Works Agency, stated that to meet the 1946–47 deficits with funds appropriated this year was not prohibited by Public Law 317 and, as far as his office is concerned, no objection thereto would ever be interposed. To illustrate how real this problem is, I would like to cite you specific cases which exist in my own congressional district. Of the nine school districts eligible for Landis Act funds, six have sizable deficits carried over from 1946–47. These are as follows:

School district:	*1946–47 deficit*
Kent Meridian School District, No. 222	$2,080.24
Kent School District, No. 413	14,526.00
Redondo Federal Way School District, No. 210	11,970.00
Auburn School District, No. 408	41,404.00
Bellevue Overlake School District, No. 405	16,000.00
Clover Park School District, No. 400	4,462.09
Total	90,442.33

So you see, gentlemen, in one congressional district alone there is a 1946–47 school deficit totaling $90,442.33 which must be met.

I sincerely hope, therefore, that in the final action this Congress will appropriate sufficient funds to meet the 1946–47 school deficits and provide the amount in 1947–48 to meet the needs of the schools which are eligible. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I shall move that we amend line 21, page 6, of this bill to strike out the figure $1,300,000 and insert the figure $2,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my appreciation to the Appropriation Committee for its action on the reclamation items in this bill and for the friendly attitude that has been shown by our Appropriation Committee toward reclamation. I think it is clear refutation of the false and partisan charges so often made that the Republican leadership is unfriendly to reclamation in our Western States. I particularly commend the fairness and discriminating judgment manifested by the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], of the Interior Subcommittee.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

FIGHT AGAINST AGRICULTURAL CREDIT ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, although we have three times as much available money and credit as we ever had before in history, interest rates continue to go up. The law of supply and demand is evidently not working in this field. I am a strong believer in a sound and adequate banking system. For that reason I have always supported the private banking system by helping to pass laws that would encourage and protect the private banking system. The agricultural credit system is also a part of our private enterprise system and should be encouraged and protected. Congress has been too good to the private banking system for this system to now take advantage of its strength and power to try to destroy our agricultural credit system. Congress provided the money to set up the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Congress made it a violation of the law for more than a very small amount to be paid by banks on time deposits—this was one of the earlier price control acts which remains in effect—Congress, in order to help the banks, made it a violation of the law for interest to be paid by a bank on demand deposits—these two provisions represent a net savings to banks of more than $500,000,000 annually compared with prewar years. I am not complaining but I am bringing these points up to remind the banks that they have been helped substantially by Congress and they should not complain if Congress extends some help in the form of credit to farm credit associations. Many other privileges and benefits to banks extended by Congress could be enumerated and if the banks continue to fight the farmers organizations it might become material to disclose them. It is my sincere hope that the banks will cease their fight against the farmers credit organizations.

The following letter by an able, public-spirited citizen of Texas, along this line is self-explanatory:

Mr. V. S. MARETT,
Chairman, Agricultural Committee,
Texas Bankers Association,
Gonzales State Bank,
Gonzales, Tex.

DEAR MR. MARETT: The conditions of our country are such that I am unable to treat lightly the letter of September 17 which you sent me asking, as chairman of the Texas Bankers' Association, for suggestions to be considered by your committee, in deciding upon its agricultural program.

In my letter last week suggesting that you propound like requests for suggestions to the Council of Economic Advisers to the President, to the Committee for Economic Development, and to the Department of Agriculture and proffer cooperation in problems pertaining to agriculture, it was my thought that such request and proffer from such source would serve to increase the interest of these groups in the problems of agriculture, as well as get suggestions from sources at the top in national economics.

To do a worth-while job will require expense. Make a worth-while program and get it and a budget of the needed expense approved by the president of the association. Submit both to member banks with requests for contributions to expense. The amount properly prorated will require small contributions of the several banks.

The two items I consider of prime importance in agriculture are soil and credit. These are of equal importance to our entire Nation. Both rural and urban people must be made aware of and kept impressed with the importance of soil conservation to them and to the entire Nation, until all become concerned. When all become concerned, that which should be done will be done. The conditions and importance of soil are told in the pamphlet Our Native Land, a Trust to Keep, and the newspaper clipping, How Strong Is America, which are enclosed herewith. I need not dwell upon the importance of soil. No country can out last its soil.

As to credit: Production of food, clothing, shelter, and everything that people use has to be produced. Credit is required in production. The larger production, the larger amount of credit. It was this Nation's credit and production that won the last war and with them, we are endeavoring to win the peace.

Production and credit require and demand a market for their products. When demand drops, production stops, and credit is left to stand and carry on or crash.

The booms and depression of recent years have taught us the need for strong and stronger credit. The depression of 1914–15 gave us the Federal Land Bank Act. The Federal Intermediate Credit Banks followed the postwar depression of 1921–22. The Coolidge prosperity largely increased credit. Demand for production began dropping in 1929. By 1933, 14,820 State and national banks with $8,484,101,000 of deposits failed. Strong as was the Federal Reserve System, the burden was too much. The credit structure of the Nation had to be strengthened. The Congress provided the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and added to the cooperative agricultural credit structure the banks for cooperatives, the production credit corporations and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation came to the assistance of banks with over $3,000,000,000 of loans to them and/or investments in their capital structure.

The land banks, intermediate credit banks, banks for cooperatives, the production credit associations, with the aid of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, shared with banks so strengthened and other lending concerns the debt burden of agriculture and all were strained to capacity.

There never was a time when our country had so great a need for strong and stronger credit institutions than the present. We must carry on. We must not crash. Both abundant credit and courage are required. Our Nation's welfare, the welfare of all Europe and the very preservation of civilization are largely dependent upon the credit strength of our Government and that of our credit institutions.

Such being the case, I am shocked and puzzled that the American Bankers' Association permits the Agricultural Commission of their association to be, at this time, endeavoring to destroy our cooperative farm credit system, which has done so much for agriculture and has been of value and convenience to commercial banks of farming sections of our country, when farmers have been unable to pay from farm income. See pages 4, 5, and 6 of Remarks by Governor of Farm Credit Administration, enclosed:

The annual cash income from Texas farms from 1928 to 1932, fell from $867,436,000 to $284,783,000—a fall of over 300 percent. Some further figures on Texas farm annual cash income: 1935—$400,542,000; 1939—$434,100,000; 1943—$1,067,269,000; 1944—$1,154,777,000. These changing conditions are not due to production but to prices that are not of the farmers' making.

What will happen if and when production shall exceed demand? Who, under the conditions now prevailing, would destroy or weaken any of our credit institutions, is more than shortsighted. He is blind as Sampson and bereft of reason.

The agricultural committee of the Texas Bankers' Association can do no greater service to agriculture, to Texas bankers and to the Nation than to acquaint itself of the advantage of cooperative credit and of cooperation in general in agriculture and become a factor in promoting it. I will mention a few items of advantage:

1. Cooperative agricultural credit possesses the strength of a government supervised and carefully directed group of thousands of farmers, as against the credit strength of an individual farmer.

2. Cooperative agricultural credit makes loans only for the purchase of land, improvements on land to be used for production and for production. The use of that credit is not inflationary as are loans for the purchase of consumer goods, now alarming the executives of the Federal Reserve Bank System.

3. The country needs the family-size farmer and farm family. Production that employs urban labor, needs the market farm families' buying power affords. For this market to serve to best advantage, these families should stop decreasing and must, in the future, have more stable income than in the past. Only by cooperation can that be attained.

4. The discovery is being made that the individual farmer cannot compete with large capital concerns, engaged in farm production of crops, with full supply of mechanized power and other machinery.

5. Collective action, by means of the corporation, has surpassed and supplanted the individual in all classes of industry except farming—proving the advantages and strength of collective action over the individual.

6. The rural community needs the collective advantages of cooperation, just as towns and villages need the collective advantages of the corporation.

7. Cooperation will strengthen and advance the industry of agriculture in the same manner the corporation has advanced other industries.

8. Finally, if we are to preserve our Government and the American way of life, we must keep the liberty-loving, independent, self-sufficient farmer and farm family, who Herbert Quick said "Are the ballast of our ship of State." Our form of government needs the stabilizing influence of our rural vote. Production needs the strength and certainty of cooperation. In cooperation, there are no strikes and no lockouts. There is no fight between labor and capital. Dr. Charles Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard, said "Cooperation affords an admirable example of collective action which does not diminish individual initiative and liberty, or

hinder the development of the individualistic virtues."

The soil conservation pamphlet and memoranda pocket book I am sending you would be a suitable and appreciated gift by banks to their farmer clientele. They can be had, without limit, for the asking.

Yours sincerely,

S. A. LINDSEY.

HIGH INTEREST

December 11, 1947, I made the following statements concerning higher interest:

There seems to be a deliberate attempt in this country, by powerful people, to greatly increase interest rates. The Government is now paying $5,000,000,000 a year interest on the national debt at the rate of 2.01 percent interest. Most of our house loans are 4 percent. A $10,000 home now can be purchased on long terms at a low rate of interest. Before 1933 such a home, as now sells for $10,000, would have been available for $4,500, but not as well constructed; and the purchaser of such a home then, on time, would have had 2 or 3 mortgages with refinancing problems practically every year and high interest rates, commissions, and fees to be paid. As high as the house is now, the purchaser, under Government standards, will not spend any more for the $10,000 house in the end than he would have spent in the end prior to 1933 for the $4,500 house. This illustration is not given to justify the high prices of homes today, but to indicate the disastrous effects of high interest rates. The result would likely be a stoppage of housing construction. If interest rates are increased, that means higher taxes in every city, county, and State in the Nation. It also means a higher cost of doing business for utilities that serve a city, which will result in higher rates to the utilities. Higher taxes and higher utility and transportation rates will mean higher wages and higher prices, both of which add to the spiral of inflation. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder is resisting this move to substantially increase long-term interest rates but the proposal is being pushed by very strong and influential people.

TIGHTER CREDIT

February 19, 1948, I made the following statement concerning higher interest rates:

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Government-owned, has been the means of keeping interest rates down the past 15 years; however, last session of Congress, the RFC was hog-tied and does not have the power to keep interest rates down that it formerly had. The lending institutions are taking advantage of this and are demanding higher and higher interest rates. This can lead to considerable trouble. The credit needs of business are very large and any increase in interest rates will be reflected in higher prices to the consumers. If the electric light, gas, water, railroads, and other utilities are compelled to pay higher interest rates, they will be seeking higher rates from the consumers, which will lead to higher taxes from the city to the Federal Government level. During the war, the average annual rate of interest paid by the Government on Government bonds was less than 2 percent; on account of tightening our interest rates the last few weeks, the average on the national debt has already increased substantially above 2 percent. Higher interest rates are already slowing housing construction.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, the House Appropriations Committee and its able chairman [Mr. TABER] are entitled to the greatest praise by every Member of this House for the outstandingly excellent job being done in cutting Government spending.

We must cut spending if we are to enjoy tax reduction. By cutting the spending this committee is making tax reduction possible and when we get tax reduction the workers get what amounts to more carry-home pay.

Tax reduction means that every citizen gets more money every pay day to take home to spend on his family rather than giving it to the Government for the politicians to spend for him.

In one respect, however, I believe this bill has gone too far in cutting costs. The item I refer to is the reduction to $1,300,000 of the $2,000,000 asked by the Federal Public Works Agency for the relief of school districts in war-swollen communities.

In one city of my district, Vancouver, Wash., the population increased from 20,000 to more than 60,000 in 3 years, largely as the result of war shipyards and war aluminum plants moving into that city.

Most of the new population moved into war housing from which the local community received no taxes. Yet the children of these newcomers—and the number of those children was great—had to be educated and the citizens of Vancouver, believing that the success of democracy depends on education, did educate those children.

The cost of this was exceedingly heavy on the school district of Vancouver. The Federal Government has shared some of that cost, but not all by any means. As a result of this heavy cost, the Vancouver school district no longer is in as good financial condition as it should be.

The Federal Works Agency which has surveyed the conditions believe that the full $2,000,000 is required to reimburse Vancouver and some 100 other similarly situated cities, and communities which suffer from war-swollen populations for the financial sacrifices the citizens of these cities and districts have made.

I hope that the full $2,000,000 originally proposed for this item will be restored in the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the committee has acted on three propositions in this proposal, and I wish to congratulate them for their good sense and statesmanship. I refer specifically to the subject matter of the Bonneville Power Administration on page 6 of the report, Mount Edgecumbe Sanatorium, Sitka, Alaska, page 7 of the report; and particularly Turnagain Arm Road in Alaska, which is covered on page 8 of the report.

Yesterday afternoon this body overwhelmingly approved the plan for European relief, which plan I voted against, and I am now satisfied that we are on the way to plenty of trouble in the years to come, and insofar as I am personally concerned, I propose to support appropriations and other proposals to build the defense of this country, to the end that we may meet the military obligations which were voted by the Congress in this European relief program.

I think Alaska is one of our strategic areas of defense, and I look upon Alaska as the buffer state between Russia and the United States, and now I look upon the United States as the buffer state between Russia and the balance of the world. I consider power production and distribution in this country as essential as bread and butter and meat; and I consider the protection of the people of Alaska as important as the protection of the people in our States, and apparently the committee is moving in this direction.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman. will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RANKIN. The highest tide in America, with probably one exception, is at Turnagain Arm Road, Cook's Inlet, Alaska, it being 48 feet. I requested the Army engineers to make a survey of the possibility of developing hydroelectric power from that tide at that place.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am in favor of developing hydroelectric power in Alaska, and I am in favor of making Alaska a State of the Union and paving the way for a million new settlers to go into that territory. We need them in that area, and we need them as quickly as we can get them there.

Mr. RANKIN. There is enough potential power in Alaska, I will say to the gentleman, if it were developed, to run a dozen States, almost.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That may be true. I have no patience at all with the argument to the effect that the Alaskan people cannot afford to pay for the State government which the Alaskan people will impose upon themselves. I have no patience with the argument to the effect that the people of the United States are able to do these other things in the world and yet we are unable to finance a new statehood in Hawaii or finance a new statehood in Alaska. So I think we had better drop that argument that some people have been using in recent months. Continuing with this matter of defense which the Committee on Appropriations has approved here on these three items, plus others which are mentioned in this bill; I am in full accord with it, and I congratulate the committee. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote for the reenactment of selective service just as quickly as the proper committee can bring it before this body. We might as well get into the harness and take up the financial obligation we have now assumed under the proposition voted upon here yesterday afternoon. I am not in favor of proceeding at this time with universal military training, and at the present time I do not propose to support it. But I do want my people to understand that although I voted against that bill yesterday afternoon, I voted my convictions on it. I still think it is an unsound course for us to have adopted. However, it is now the policy of this country, and I have serious doubts now whether this Congress should further support the reduction in taxes, because there is very little sense in our voting tax reductions

and then voting as we did yesterday afternoon. I shall not be at all disappointed if the President's veto of the tax bill is not overridden, because it will simply be a piecemeal affair; for next year we will need between $45,000,000,000 and $55,000,000,000 or more in the Budget on today's price levels. At the same time, I am not going to raise any bitter argument about giving the people a little grass for the current calendar year in the way of a tax reduction. But as we give it to them, we had better say to them that we will increase taxes next year or we will go into deficit financing. I do not propose to support deficit financing where the national income is running at the rate of $225,000,000,000 to $250,000,000,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction of buildings: In addition to the appropriation of $1,377,920 contained in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947, for the construction of an engineering building and women's dormitory units on the grounds of Howard University, the Public Buildings Administration is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of said appropriation in an amount not to exceed $1,706,000: *Provided*, That no contract shall be entered into for such purposes which will result in a total cost to the Federal Government for completion of such buildings in excess of $1,788,000 for the engineering building and $1,378,000 for the women's dormitory units: *Provided further*, That the limitations on contract authority and total cost may be exceeded or shall be reduced by an amount equal to the percentage increase or decrease, if any, in construction costs generally dating from January 1, 1948, as determined by the Federal Works Administrator: *Provided further*, That transfers of funds may be made to the Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency, of amounts appropriated for construction of these buildings.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 6, after line 7, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

"Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico): For an additional amount for payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4), $2,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in my honest opinion, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is one of the best agencies of the Government I have ever run across. They have appealed to the Deficiency Committee this year for $2,000,000, and that has been stricken from the bill you have before you this afternoon.

I noticed in reading the report of the committee that they have denied this $2,000,000 for additional grants to States on the basis that they claim that the testimony discloses that these programs are successful in only 38 percent of the cases. They go further to say that on this basis it seems fair to say that expenditures in 62 percent of the cases are wasted because they fail to result in placing the individuals involved on an employable basis. This is a misleading statement.

When I read this statement this afternoon, having only finished with the testimony of this agency 3 or 4 weeks ago before the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security Appropriations, I checked into the figures we received in the hearings held by our committee, and I find that this statement is completely misleading. Apparently the Deficiency Committee, in considering these percentages, took into consideration that there were 112,000 applicants for vocational rehabilitation and only 43,800 were actually rehabilitated. The truth of the matter is that, out of the 112,000 applications for rehabilitation, 46,000 were thrown out on the basis of the application and the individuals would receive no help whatever. An additional 20,000 were thrown out after they had applied. Therefore the actual figures are that 46,000 applicants were taken into the program and 43,800 were rehabilitated and are employed today, which on a percentage basis means that 94.3 percent are now employed. That is a pretty good record for a Government agency to establish on the applicants they work with. Mind you, on the basis of the economy of our country, those 44,000 persons who were rehabilitated in 1947 have an earning capacity now of $70,000,000. They are turning in to the Federal Government in taxes $5,600,000. As a result, for every dollar that we appropriate for this program the Federal Government gets in return $10. It is not only beneficial to the Government, it is beneficial to every community in this country. It is beneficial to every State in the country.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Is it not true that the States have appropriated as much money as they expected the Federal Government would match with Federal funds, and that the programs have been started to rehabilitate disabled persons? Those programs will be curtailed and the money then will be wasted that has already been put into the program.

Mr. FOGARTY. You are absolutely right. If these $2,000,000 are refused it means that the number of applicants they had hoped to rehabilitate in the year 1948 cannot be rehabilitated. They must say to 2,000 or 3,000 people who have been promised these services and this help by the Federal Government that the Congress refuses to appropriate the necessary amount to rehabilitate them in the year 1948. They will be told, "You will just have to wait your turn." Read the hearings before the deficiency committee. There was no justification, in my opinion, to leave out this $2,000,000. That is one of the best agencies in the country today. It is doing most good for those who do not have a chance to get by. It gives to every person who is of employable age and who can be rehabilitated a chance to hold his head high in the society of his own community and not be a ward of that particular community. Of these additional funds that are asked for, there is nothing that goes for additional personnel. What they are trying to do is to get $2,000,000 to bring their program for the year 1948 up to date mainly because of the rise in the cost of living and the rise in the cost of services which are necessary to take care of these poor, unfortunate people.

The only money out of these $2,000,000 which will go for anything else is $75,000 for audit adjustments. I think any sound governmental agency wants to make sure that their agency is in a sound fiscal position and so that they know where every dime is being spent.

This agency asked for $3,500,000 more than we allowed them for the fiscal year 1949. I offered an amendment at that time to raise the amount from eighteen million dollars to twenty-one-million-four-hundred-thousand-and-some-odd dollars. I gave as my reasons that the economic value to our Government was great as was the humane value to the person who was being rehabilitated. My distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], admitted that it was a great program. But the only thing that he had to offer that day was, "We must stop somewhere." Now I realize also that these things cannot keep going on and on pyramiding year after year, but we are responsible for this money that they are asking for now. We passed the original law. This law has been in effect since 1920. Five years ago the Congres liberalized the law. We placed no limitations then on the amounts that could be expended. If we want to do this in the right way and place a limitation on the amounts to be appropriated by this Congress or future Congresses, we should put a limitation in as to the number of people who can be rehabilitated year after year. In that program which they have for 1949, if they receive the $3,500,000 additional, they could by their own figures rehabilitate 64,000 people in the next fiscal year who will have an earning capacity of $100,000,000. They would pay in Federal taxes about $9,000,000 to say nothing of State and local taxes, not taking into consideration the relief load which would be lifted from the local communities and the States and our Federal Government as well.

Mr. Chairman, if there was ever a more worth-while project in our Government; one so necessary in the functions of those who are not able, through no fault of their own, to earn a living for themselves, I have never heard of it. It is a responsibility we owe to those unfortunate people. There is something that can be done about it. We can get them back on their feet. It is a worth-while program and I sincerely hope that this House this afternoon will grant this $2,000,000 additional that this Agency needs for the fiscal year 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in behalf of this amendment. Like the previous speaker, I, too, am deeply interested in this program, but from a different angle. I am interested in the trainees, the prospective trainees, who would like to retrain in order that they might become self-supporting and not be a liability upon the Government any longer.

There are two justifications, I think, for the restoration of this $2,000,000 requested in the original budget. In the first place, the $2,000,000 represents just about the percentage of the budget that our cost-of-living percentage has risen over the past year. In addition to that the war industries during the war period were a great hazard to those people who were engaged in the industry. A great many people, because of accidents, had to retrain in order that they may become self-supporting.

I would like to give you a little incident in my experience as executive officer of that program in New Mexico. During part of the year 1944 and the fiscal year ending July 1, 1945, we had trained 79 people who were really ready for entering employment again. The first year's check on their salaries, their earnings, amounted to something over $100,000 for those 79 workers who were retrained under the program. Their withholding taxes or income taxes amounted to more than half of the year's Federal money received by the State for the support of the program. If those 79 people could do that in 1 year it would not take very long to pay back their debt to the Government for their training. I cannot think of any program that the Government sponsors that does as much good as vocational rehabilitation. It is true that the program is not so well known, but it is not well known for one special reason. The instructors and the supervisors and the workers in this program go quietly about their work, because it is the desire of the leadership to protect the unfortunate people who need the training. If too much publicity were given to the work and to the opportunities offered, it might result in a hesitancy on the part of some people to retrain, and I think it is very wise that they do protect the trainees. I would like to urge that every Member reconsider and help to restore this very much needed $2,000,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I would just like to get these percentages straightened out. The statement in the report is completely misleading that only 38 percent of the program has been successful. They had 111,000 cases in 1947. They screened out 45,000 before they gave them any service at all. They screened out an additional 20,000 after they had been talked to, which left a net sum of 46,000 persons who were in the program, and out of 46,500, 43,800 were rehabilitated in 1947, which is an average of 94.3 percent successful.

Mrs. LUSK. I am glad to answer the gentleman from Rhode Island that in our case more than 90 percent of the trainees are successful when they reenter employment. We have in New Mexico a health situation. A great many people come there for health purposes, and when they are able to work again they must learn to do something that will not be too much of a hazard upon their health after they have recovered from tuberculosis or other respiratory troubles. Those people have to be given some opportunity to learn a new work. This is the only program that provides that opportunity. Too many of the prospective trainees have no money for education after they have undergone medical care and health resoration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. KEEFE] if this $2,000,000 is not appropriated will it curtail the services to disabled persons that have already been started?

Mr. KEEFE. My understanding is that it will curtail the number of those that come into the program.

Mr. POTTER. In other words, a trainee who has already started and is in the middle of his training will not be dropped because of lack of funds?

Mr. KEEFE. That is my understanding of it. It will simply curtail the number that they take in month after month, that is all. I read the record, and I hope the gentleman heard the questions and the answers that I directed to Mr. Shortly, the director.

Mr. POTTER. I was not certain about that and I wanted it cleared up.

Mr. KEEFE. That is my understanding of it. In other words, they have certain people who are eligible for the program and they bring them in from month to month as they dig them out of the population. It simply means that a reduced number will have the availability of the program to the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. POTTER. On page 3 of the report it is stated that only 38 percent of the cases have been successful. What is the basis for that?

Mr. KEEFE. I did not write that report, as the gentleman well knows. While I am a member of the committee, it is not my report. The basis for it was the language of the gentlemen who testified before the Deficiency Committee. It is found on page 431 of the hearings. I read the questions and the answers from the hearings, and there it is:

> About what percentage are you able to make a go of?
>
> Mr. BURNS. That is running about 38 percent of cases closed.

That is plain English to me.

Mr. POTTER. That seems to coincide with what the gentleman on the other side said, that that includes the cases that came in and applied and were automatically closed without service being rendered, because they were not eligible, possibly, for the training.

I am not exactly a novice in the field of vocational rehabilitation. I think it is very essential that we salvage as many broken bodies as possible. In fact, I much prefer to vote for an amendment that will provide $2,000,000, which will be matched by the States, thus having a $4,000,000 training program for disabled civilians, so that those people will become tax producers and not tax consumers.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Boyle C. Scurlock, director of vocational rehabilitation division, State Department of Vocational Education of the State of Oklahoma, dated March 19, 1948, in which Mr. Scurlock said to me:

> It is gratifying to know that you, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the appropriations for vocational education and rehabilitation, are alert to some of the dangers to these programs, and are conscious of the need for good State-Federal relations in programs such as these, where both State and Federal funds are involved.

The arguments which have been made in behalf of this amendment are not tenable. The arguments against it are fully supported by the record, as reflected in the printed hearings. The amendment should be voted down.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, so that the Members may have the exact picture on this and may know what it is, there was enough appropriated for this current year so that there were allotments made for four quarters of $4,500,000 for each quarter. There is remaining $4,500,000 to carry it through the balance of the ficsal year, to the first of July. If we add $2,000,000 to this, it raises the total for the quarter to $6,500,000. There is no State contribution with reference to this item. Four times six and a half million would be setting this agency up on a $26,000,000 basis for a year. We have just passed a bill providing $18,000,000 for next year, after the House had thoroughly considered the matter.

So that there may be no misunderstanding about the number of people involved, this question was asked, and I read from page 430 of the hearings:

> The CHAIRMAN. How many people are involved in this set-up? How many beneficiaries are there in this set-up through the year?
>
> Mr. BURNS. About 170,000. They are the the persons who are receiving rehabilitation services during the course of the year.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. How long is the average period of rehabilitation?
>
> Mr. BURNS. That has been running just around 1 year. Out of that group, we expect 53,000 or 54,000 to come out who are rehabilitated—that is, successfully rehabilitated.

The CHAIRMAN. You expect 54,000 to be rehabilitated——

Mr. BURNS. During this year.

The CHAIRMAN. And the others will not be; is that it?

Mr. BURNS. The most of them will not be.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Does that not mean that they will not be rehabilitated and their training will have to be given up and will have to go over until next year?

Mr. TABER. I do not know. He says not during this year, but some of them would be rehabilitated in the opening months of next year.

There are 170,000 beneficiaries; 54,000 would come out. Then I asked them about what percentage they were able to make a go of, and Mr. Burns said, as appears on page 431 of the hearings, "That is running about 38 percent of the cases closed."

I am friendly toward this program, but it does seem to me that we have been very liberal in providing aid when we can take care of as many cases as we are taking care of. We should not go ahead and add more than 50 percent to the cost of this thing at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 48, noes 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance and operation of schools: For an additional amount for "Maintenance and operation of schools," $1,300,000; and the limitation under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for administrative expenses, is increased from "$50,000" to "$70,000."

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TOLLEFSON: On page 6, line 21, strike out the figure "$1,300,000" and insert the figure "$2,000,000."

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that I dislike very much to offer an amendment which proposes to increase an item to which I am sure the Committee on Appropriations has given studious consideration.

I note in reading the hearings that considerable testimony was taken on this point, and I know that the committee has discussed this item considerably. However, I would be derelict in my obligation as I see it toward the people in my area if I did not seek to increase this item from the amount that is in the bill, namely $1,300,000 to the amount that was requested by the Federal Works Agency, namely, $2,000,000. This item does not apply to the majority of the Members of the House. It applies only to those gentlemen who come from areas where the population was increased because of war industry activity. To cite just a simple example so that those of you who do not live in those areas will understand the problem, I will refer to one of the seven school districts that exist in my area. In the town of Renton, the population prior to the war was approximately 5,000. During the war that population increased to 15,000. In other words, the population tripled. It is easy to understand the increase in the educational facility requirements which were necessary. The school district in which Renton is situated, and the services which were required for the school children who live in the Federal housing areas which sprang up, almost tripled.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman seeks to reinstate that portion which was authorized by the first session of the Eightieth Congress, is that not correct?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Approximately, but not quite.

Mr. COLMER. Not quite all of it?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is right.

Mr. COLMER. But the House had authorized it, and the Committee on Appropriations cut it down during the last session to approximately half.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct. And may I say to the gentleman at this point that I am aware of his interest in this matter and of his strenuous efforts over a long period of time to secure Federal aid for our schools. He is to be commended for his excellent work.

Mr. COLMER. I just want to say I am for the gentleman's amendment and I hope the House will concur in it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The amount which these small schools would get would still be $500,000 less than the House authorized for the schools.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I can name right offhand four districts in my State that are in exactly the condition the gentleman describes. I am for the amendment heartily.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Some difficulty exists in many of the school districts of my own State, as the gentleman knows, one particularly in the Hanford area. Forty thousand people came into that one area where there were no people living before. The school district there is a Federal project. The people come there to work for the Federal Government, and most of them are veterans. The Federal Government has the responsibility of providing necessary facilities not only for housing but for carrying on the schooling of these children where the local people have no opportunity at all to afford the schooling which the Federal Government has been affording.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

There are Members who come from areas that do not have this problem and the question may occur to them as to the efforts being made by the local school district or by the State. Referring again to this situation in the town of Renton, their resources are limited, and approximately 60 percent of the tax money paid by the citizens of that school district goes for school purposes. So the local areas are contributing to their fullest extent to cover their school costs. The State government likewise is doing everything that it possibly can within the limitation imposed by the constitution and the laws of the State of Washington.

Now, a further question arises with respect to tax money from the housing areas. These housing areas are federally owned and cannot be taxed. It is true that the Federal Government makes payments in lieu of txes, but it is agreed that that amount of money paid in lieu of taxes does not meet the need. There is no need to go into detail in the matter of Federal aid advanced to these districts, because that matter was fully covered when the Lanham Act was passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can get a limitation on debate. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section close in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks after the vote on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think it is a very worth-while, fair, and desirable amendment. After much debate last year the Congress authorized $5,000,000 to help out these weak school districts whose enrollment had been vastly increased because of definite war activities.

It was not any catch-all proposition, it was carefully limited to about 193 Lanham Act schools that had this unusual enrollment burden placed upon them—this staggering burden—because of the location of war plants and industries, Boeing Aircraft, Douglas Aircraft, or some other big war installation. We therefore put money in the authorization bill because of this Government responsibility.

Although their estimate was that they required $5,500,000 it was reduced by the

House to $5,000,000. This Appropriations Committee is reducing the amount authorized by $1,200,000. They are even cutting $700,000 from the bare minimum recommended by the Public Works Administration. This administration has already reduced the schools' total requests of $5,500,000 down to $4,914,000.

In other words, there has been a burden of several hundred thousands already placed on these schools of money that they will not get and now we are cutting it further, $650,000 in addition to this reduction.

I know it will be argued by the Appropriations Committee that $614,000 of this money represents a deficit for the preceding year. It does represent a deficit, but in all of the past history of the administration of this act we have covered those deficits within the current year's appropriation.

So what in effect we will be doing if we deny this additional $700,000 to these 135 small school districts is short-changing them by $700,000. We are going to take it out of the educational budgets of these small schools burdened by this increased enrollment that was placed on them by the mighty United States Government. We are refusing to go along with our plain and simple responsibility if we refuse this $700,000 appropriation. Remember that it is still $500,000 less than the House itself has authorized for this emergency school work.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice to that of others who are urging that the amount for the Federal Works Agency, to be used for certain public schools, be increased from $1,300,000 to the full amount of the budget estimate of $2,000,000. Let it be remembered that all of this and more has been authorized.

This valuable help to schools which found themselves faced with building and personnel problems, because of war-swollen population in certain areas, has meant a great deal to many of the Arizona schools, just as it has to schools throughout our country. Without it they could not have carried on. Certain of them in Arizona would have found it impossible to meet those after-war problems, and even today some of the same schools are still handling overloads that are a direct consequence of shifting populations due to war activities. As I indicated to the gentleman offering the amendment, such is the case of Issac school district and Washington school district on the outskirts of Phoenix, and Sunnyside school district and Amphitheater school district on the outskirts of Tucson. I have now in my office pleas from officials of the schools and from school-board members, urging that I do everything possible to continue these Federal funds, as otherwise their educational activities would have to be limited through part-time classes or greatly overloaded classes, or through reduction in the length of the school term.

At the same time that we are helping democratic forces abroad, let us not forget that the very basis of democracy—and the only hope for its continuation—lies in an educated and well-informed citizenry. Let us remember this, as we vote on this particular item to make more funds available for the education of American children in areas made critical by war conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SANBORN].

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the pending amendment because of the condition of schools in my district. The Pocatello school has been under a heavy expense in providing school facilities for children belonging to employees of the naval gun reboring establishment and the school authorities find themselves in a very difficult situation on this account. I know that the committee is taking the position that under this law deficits from previous years cannot be considered. As a matter of fact, however, the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, Frank L. Yates, rendered an opinion to the committee on this point, from which I quote the following:

> As the indebtedness of a particular school district is a legal obligation which it cannot avoid, I think it only reasonable to regard such obligation as in the nature of an encumbrance upon the income of the school district and that, in a real sense, such portion of its income is not available for maintenance and operation expenses within the contemplation of the agreements entered into between the school agencies and the Federal Government. In other words, the amount which is actually available for such expenses is represented by the net funds remaining from estimated income after deduction of such amounts as may be required to satisfy proper obligations incurred in the prior school year. For these reasons, this method of determining the amount of the Government's contribution for school purposes is not believed to be prohibited by Public Law 317, supra, and, so far as this office is concerned, no objection thereto will be interposed.

Mr. Chairman, that answers the objections that the committee has raised in connection with this matter. It is certainly necessary to have more money in this appropriation than the bill calls for. In previous appropriations there has been an actual deficit and that deficit has not been taken care of. As a result, deficits have occurred in these schools.

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

Mr. SANBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. If this amendment is agreed to will it then go beyond the authorization of the amounts provided for these schools such as the gentleman has described?

Mr. SANBORN. I think not.

Mr. DONDERO. How much is left of the $5,000,000 that was authorized and not yet appropriated.

Mr. SANBORN. About a half-million dollars, I believe, which is being processed at the present time.

Mr. DONDERO. The bill has in it $1,300,000. The amendment would raise that to $2,000,000. Will that take it beyond the amount authorized by the Congress?

Mr. SANBORN. I think not.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. In confirmation of the gentleman's statement here may I read the following telegram which I have just received:

> POCATELLO, IDAHO, *April 1, 1948.*
> Congressman ABE GOFF,
> *House of Representatives:*
> Actual deficit due Pocatello schools unpaid by Federal Government through Lanham Act now called Landis Act on June 30, 1947, $19,156.23. Entreat you appear before lower House this afternoon with this telegram and present Pocatello status. Thanks.
> GEORGE N. GREEN,
> *Superintendent of Schools.*

This represents the amount that should have been paid by the Government to the school.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this particular cause is one for which I have a great deal of sympathy. Last year I introduced one of the first bills that proposed to establish a fund so that the various Federal agencies which create common school problems in various parts of the country might have the funds to meet the educational responsibilities that developed. That was a very broad bill. Several other Members of the House introduced similar bills.

The matter was considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] will recall the history of the legislation because he was helpful in the presentation that was made. When the presentation was made to the Committee on Education and Labor it became evident that the amount involved, if we took up the problem of providing schooling for the national parks and the national forests and all the military reservations and all the public housing projects, would be so large that the Committee on Education and Labor just backed away from it and said, "We cannot tackle that problem at this time." Then an emergency arose for we had the expiration of the Lanham Act facing us, and we sought to get a bill through to provide money for this purpose. I personally wrote the text of the bill on which this appropriation is made, and it was introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]. We wrote it as we did so that it could be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, which heard the testimony, rather than as an amendment of the Lanham Act which would have gone to the Public Works Committee. We did that for the purpose of expediting consideration by getting the bill before the committee which had heard the whole testimony. It was in the closing days of the session. The bill passed the House. The Budget estimate was sent before the Senate and there, growing out of an item that was put in the Senate and growing out of the conference, $2,500,000 was provided. The budget estimates came up for an additional $2,000,000 this year. The reason that the Committee on Appropriations has recommended $1,300,000

is that that is in accord with the analysis of the problem made by the administrative agency.

On page 13 of the hearings Mr. Field said:

> To date we have not financed any of the last year's deficit because I felt there was a question in the minds of our own staff as to whether or not, due to the limited funds available, we should finance a deficit that occurred prior to July 1, 1947.

And General Fleming, who is the head of the Public Works Agency, in making the request for the funds before the Senate committee testified:

> These funds will be used in aid of maintenance and operation of schools, 1947–48.

I am taking this position because I think good faith requires it in keeping with the presentation that was made as to what this money was to be used for, which was for the use of schools to meet their operating expenses in 1947 and 1948. It is true that the Comptroller General has said that it is not illegal to use some of the money to pay for deficits of prior years, but that is not in keeping with the plea on which the bill was originally presented. And let me suggest to you that there is a very bad principle involved there if we recognize the principle that school districts or any local taxing body can make up its budget as it pleases and pass its deficits off to the Federal Government. We have then surrendered to local taxing bodies the right to make levies upon the Federal Treasury. The amendment should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is slightly in error in his recital of the history of this school aid appropriation. I know he did not intend to be but he, like the balance of us, has many things on his mind these days.

The authorization for aid to schools in the war congested areas was for $5,000,000 as he has said. The appropriation bill containing it was brought up in the House in almost the closing hours of the first session of the Eightieth Congress last July. And in ironing out differences between the House and Senate bills, the appropriation was reduced $2,500,000. I, among others, opposed that and in the House debate pointed out that according to the best estimates we could get, the whole $5,000,000 would be needed. However, I recall distinctly that several other Members suggested that since the estimates might be in error, we should concur in the $2,500,000 appropriation, and that if it should be found that the amount so appropriated was insufficient, a deficiency appropriation could be passed during the second session of the Eightieth Congress making up the needed amount.

The appropriate agency administering this law requested a deficiency appropriation of $2,000,000 in the present bill. But the appropriation committee has cut that to $1,300,000. The sum eliminated by the committee was requested for the purpose of paying to something more than 130 schools, most of them small, the sums still due them on commitments of prior years which were not fully paid because of lack of funds.

Now this came about not by reason of any error in the budget estimates of the schools, as the gentleman from South Dakota suggested. It came about because commitments made to those schools by the appropriate Government agency were not paid in full. I think we will be setting no bad precedent whatever to up the appropriation in this bill to the $2,000,000 requested. These funds are badly needed by the schools. It may be that this does not represent a debt of the United States Government in a legal sense, but to my way of thinking it does represent a moral obligation, and I trust you will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, prior to World War II the normal enrollment in school district No. 4, Charleston County, S. C., was 4,000 students. As a result of naval shipbuilding activities and other military installations activities the enrollment reached a top figure of 10,356. Since the war the enrollment dropped to 8,838 in 1947, a mere 15 percent of maximum influx. The large increase in enrollment was due to the increase in Federal activities in school district No. 4. The largest of these Federal industries is the Charleston naval shipyard. It, according to a recent newspaper statement by the Commandant, employs more persons than any other industry in South Carolina. The Army installations have virtually closed out, but the people they brought there are still living where they were during the war, in Cooper River School District No. 4. Most of the property is permanently off the tax books, the ones now in existence are not assessed for tax purposes inasmuch as they are owned either by the Federal Government or the State. The school district is facing a deficit in operating funds. The only fair solution is Federal assistance, which may be done through continuation of the Lanham Act.

Another situation in the First Congressional District of South Carolina is at Beaufort, adjacent to Parris Island, the Marine boot training camp. Beaufort is also the location of a new $10,000,000 naval hospital. Again, the only fair solution is Federal assistance, which may be done through continuation of the Lanham Act. Accordingly, I urge such continuation, for at least another year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TOLLEFSON) there were—ayes 42, noes 51.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 68, noes 65.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, the action of the House of Representatives on Spain and the European recovery program is perhaps a diplomatic disaster that can be repaired. So Mr. Walter Lippmann says this morning in his syndicated column that goes throughout the Nation. What he means is, of course, that the conferees still have a chance to repair the injury done to our foreign policy in the hasty action that was taken by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Lippmann is not alone in describing our action as a diplomatic disaster. The newspaper columnists and the radio commentators of this Nation and the world have been talking these last 48 hours about the unfortunate vote that was taken in the House. The amendment was adopted, let us remember, after a few minutes of hasty debate. Never did so many people know so little about so much as when the Members voted on the Spain amendment.

The founding fathers, when they wrote our Constitution, never intended that the foreign policy of this Nation was to be formulated in heated, ill-considered, and hasty debate by the lower House. Foreign policy that affects our national security into the far future demands mature consideration. It cannot be arrived at in the manner in which we adopted the amendment on Spain.

This amendment has not changed the position of Spain in relation to the other nations of Europe. Those who are friends of the present Government of Spain have not brought Spain into the European recovery program by this amendment.

But the 188 Members that voted for this amendment have given a club to the Communists in Europe and around the world to beat over the head the liberals who are fighting for free government today. We have greatly jeopardized the chances of the non-Communist forces to win the Italian election. Is that what we wanted?

The 188 Members that voted for this amendment struck a blow at the United Nations, which passed a resolution to which we were a party, condemning the Franco government. Is this what the House of Representatives wanted?

The amendment was a blow to the leadership of the United States within the United Nations. Is that what the House of Representatives wanted? The manner in which the vote was taken on Spain is something that we ought to reexamine, so that in the future when we proceed to make foreign policy on the highest level in this lower House, we will understand what we are doing and we will understand that we cannot act in the hasty, ill-considered manner in which we acted on Spain if we intend to retain our Nation's place of leadership in the world and if we intend to win the

ideological battle upon which we have embarked everywhere in the world.

Do we not know that arms alone cannot guarantee our national security? I pose the question asked by Sumner Welles, "Are we prepared to agree that our moral prestige and the confidence of other peoples in the good faith of this country are no longer vital elements of our national security?"

Are we prepared to become the champions of fascism wherever it exists in the world?

We must not in our efforts to oppose communism take steps which destroy our moral integrity.

I pray that the conferees will repair the damage that has been done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: For an additional amount for administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, $3,000,000.

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PEDEN: On page 9, line 5, after "administration", insert "including necessary contact representatives."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEDEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I have no personal objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PEDEN. I am pleased to know that we are all in accord in recognizing the valuable service rendered by the contact representatives. The recent reduction in this type of service in many parts of the country is working great hardships on the veterans. This is the real grass-root service of the Veterans' Administration and should be maintained in every instance where possible. This amendment will make certain the reinstatement of all the necessary contact representatives who have been notified to close such services to the veterans.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, in connection with our consideration of additional appropriatons for the Veterans' Administration, I am prompted to make an observation with reference to Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of that Agency.

Today marks the completion of the third month of his incumbency of that office. At the time his appointment was announced by President Truman, I advised my colleagues of the House of the splendid background, training, and character Mr. Gray possessed and predicted for him a highly successful term of office. His management of the affairs of the Veterans' Administration in the last 3 months furnishes the best evidence of the truth of my previous observations. It can truly be said that we now have an exceptionally able Administrator of the largest of our Government agencies. In recent appearances before the Appropriations Committee in connection with the issuance of orders providing for a reduction of personnel in order to keep within his appropriations, I am advised that he impressed the members of the committee with his ability, forthrightness, and sound character. I am sure that Carl Gray believes that it is his function to administer the veterans' laws in the manner and spirit in which they are enacted by the Congress and within the fiscal limitations prescribed by it. Although his recent order prescribing a reduction in personnel was not a pleasant act for him to perform, it was done in order to maintain his agency within the congressonal appropriations of money, and is evidentuary of his desire to manage the Veterans' Administration in accordance with the rule book. The Goverment has long needed able men like General Gray.

We wish General Gray continued success in office. His many years of responsible executive experience and the record he has established in the first 3 months of office furnishes every reason for our belief that he will go on and establish for himself a record as an outstanding Government Administrator.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. PEDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Loans: The authorization under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1948, for borrowings from the Secretary of the Treasury under section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, is increased from "$225,000,000" to "$300,000,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: On page 10, line 7, strike out "$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$400,000,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the merits of the Rural Electrification Administration have been debated so often and so exhaustively here on the floor that Members of the House are familiar with its advantages and its needs. So I shall not take the time of the House to discuss it except to say that if you comb over the entire rural area of the United States this afternoon you would not find a single farmer in the entire United States who does not favor adequate provision for its support. The farmers of America sometimes find it difficult to get together. They may disagree on many matters, but there is one thing on which they are unanimously agreed, and that is on the benefits of the Rural Electrification Administration and the importance of providing adequate facilities for its maintenance and expansion.

And I think, Mr. Chairman, there is no Member of the House of Representatives here this afternoon who is not thoroughly convinced of the invaluable service rendered by Rural Electrification to rural America in particular and the Nation in general.

The only question then, which presents itself here this afternoon in connection with this amendment is the amount needed for the development and wholesome growth of REA at this time and the advantage of making provision for the full budget estimate at this time.

For that is all we are asking in this amendment. That the Committee instead of cutting the appropriation $100,000,000 below the budget estimate, allow the full amount.

It is purely a mathematical proposition at this time, according to the most recently ascertainable data, there are pending applications requiring $306,000,000 in loans. And there will accumulate during the coming fiscal year applications requiring $500,000,000 additional funds. Under the terms of the bill this appropriation will be available after the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1948, and will require, even for the loans now in sight, a minimum of $806,000,000 between the date of the approval of this act and June 30, 1949.

To meet this need of $806,000,000 to finance applications already in sight, we will have the $400,000,000 carried in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, and the $75,000,000 proposed by the committee in this bill. That will be only $475,000,000 to supply $806,000,000 needed in the next 15 months.

Even if you provide the full $175,000,000, the full budget estimate, as provided by the pending amendment, we will still have only $575,000,000 in funds to meet $806,000,000 in applications. There are farmers all over the Nation who have had their applications for current on file for 2 and 3 years. Many have had their houses and barns wired, and appliances installed, for months; but they are without service because we have not appropriated enough money to process their loans. It is true, as the chairman will say, that poles and copper wire and transformers are not immediately available; but the sooner they are ordered, the sooner they will be delivered, and without this appropriation we cannot file their orders.

I could understand the committee's position if this item and this appropriation involved a grant or a gratuity or a contribution of any kind on the part of the Government. But it is not a grant. It is a loan. And it is a loan on the best of security. It is a loan which will be paid back with interest. There is in neither this paragraph of the bill, nor in this amendment, a charge of a single penny against the United States Treasury. It is strictly a business transaction with the undisputed assurance that the Government will get back, not only the principal of the loan in full, but substantial interest as well, a highly attractive investment.

And it means increased health, happiness, and prosperity for the farm family. It is a proposition in which the Government has everything to gain and nothing to lose.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I believe the gentleman will agree that the security required by the REA on these loans is such that they must be repaid. It is not a question of dishing out as we did in the bill we passed yesterday. We are going to get back this money, and get it back with interest. Am I not correct?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is eminently correct. The collateral is the best security in the world based on monthly cash payments for service which may be

discontinued for nonpayment. The experience of REA over the dozen years since it was initiated in 1936 has been one of continued repayment of loans before maturity and prompt liquidation of all accrued interest.

I trust the amendment will be agreed to and the full amount of the budget estimate provided.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last year we appropriated for this year or provided loan funds totaling $225,000,000. Of those figures they have been able to allocate $155,000,000 to the twelfth day of March. Under those circumstances when the budget estimate was submitted for increasing this figure by $175,000,000 we felt that the item should be analyzed and that we should know what was going on. Mr. Wickard stated that they probably could allocate $81,000,000 the rest of the year. We have provided an increase of $75,000,000. Let me read you a little bit of Mr. Wickard's testimony out of the hearings. You will remember that the Agriculture Committee gave Mr. Wickard for this particular purpose $100,000,000 more than the budget estimate, and then gave him $400,000,000 to be used next year. Now listen to what Mr. Wickard says about this picture on page 1284 of the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. Have you taken into consideration in making that statement the amount that this committee has recommended?

Mr. WICKARD. That is what I was just about to speak of. We did not know when we made the recommendation for $175,000,000 a little over 2 months ago that the committee was going to recommend the $400,000,000 which the committee recommended yesterday.

In other words, they did not know that they were going to get this $400,000,000 that was given to them in the agricultural appropriation bill the other day. This estimate was put up without their knowing anything about it. Now, Mr. Wickard tells us that this amount that we cut out will be carried over, if it is provided, into next year and we give him about $500,000,000 to allocate because they cannot allocate much more than the $81,000,000 that he talks about the rest of this year. All of their allocations have been larger this year than the expenditures. The expenditures have been behind the allocations and they have just been building up a great big pile of allocations.

I want to see the program go ahead, but what happens when you try to crowd it too hard and try to get too much money? You create in the market a great big backlog of demand for these generators, copper wire and all that sort of thing which are required to go ahead with these electrical activities. You delay, you increase the price, you create inflation; you really hurt the farmer and make this stuff cost the farmer more money. The fellow who is really interested in this thing and really wants to see it move ahead in an intelligent way, wants to see it done in an orderly manner so that the orders that flow into the factories for these things will not be so much more than the factories are able to take care of. You are really not improving your position if you go ahead and increase this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support of the pending amendment. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I have an identical amendment to that offered by the gentleman from Missouri on the Speaker's desk. It seems to me that if we are going to keep the construction of the REA projects proceeding in a satisfactory and orderly manner this amendment must be adopted. We have a critical power situation in my State and in many of the States of the West and Northwest. I have read over the entire hearings in connection with this item and it seems to me that in view of the fact that the Rural Electrification Administration has a terrific backlog of loan applications, many of which were made before the last war, we have waited long enough to catch up on these applications. It is true that the Administration has been making allotments of around $23,000,000 per month but the Administrator stated at the hearings that if funds were available the program could be accelerated so that they could process loan applications and make allocations of upward of thirty-five or forty million dollars per month.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another reason why this item should be increased from seventy-five to one hundred and seventy-five million dollars. Under the basic law, the Administrator is required to allot 50 percent of the appropriation in proportion to the number of unelectrified farms in each State, as compared with the number of unelectrified farms in the country, and so half of the money appropriated here today must be allocated with a certain proportion to each State, according to that formula. It must be borne in mind that these funds must be held for the various States until the end of the fiscal year. The remainder of the funds may be distributed among the States with the proviso that not more than 10 percent may go to any one State. As it stands today, the Rural Electrification Administration has around $57,000,000 that has not been loaned but all of those funds have been committed.

And so it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that inasmuch as all of the funds available to the administration have been loaned, and because of the fact that the Administrator is required to allot one-half of the moneys appropriated to the several States of the Union that certainly if the Administrator is going to take care of the urgent applications already approved in the field and presently in his hands here in Washington, that this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation. Because of lack of funds the REA cooperatives in the various counties of my district particularly have been unable to place orders for equipment and supplies which they need to extend their lines, whereas the utility companies can always place their orders. They have the funds with which to pay for them, therefore, they get the preference in the delivery of those orders, thereby delaying construction of REA projects.

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman is exactly right. Last year rural electric service was extended to 345,000 new REA consumers. About 80 percent of them are farmers. The fact is that the Intermountain and Western States have more applications than any other section of the country. In fact we have a backlog of over $2,500,000 of applications in the State of Wyoming alone. There is more oil development in Wyoming than in any other State in the Union at the present time. People living in the oil fields and the operators themselves are desperately in need of power that is unavailable to them.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. They cannot order the material until the funds are in their hands.

Mr. BARRETT. That is precisely right. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I would also like to make a little statement to help clarify this situation, if I may.

This amendment, in effect, raises by $175,000,000 the appropriation made in the Agriculture supply bill last year for fiscal 1948, the current year. This is raised because of the tremendous backlogs, some of them existing since 1939, of work that ought to be done on extensions of existing REA's. The money will not be withdrawn from the Treasury nor become an obligation until it has actually gone through contractual arrangements and supplies have been bought to extend lines. But, in order for them to contract in the market, in competition with utilities and other cooperative enterprises, it is necessary that we appropriate the money, which will not be spent except as I have indicated. Now, I think it is significant that the Administration only requested of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1949 $325,000,000. The Department of Agriculture brought to the House in the President's budget $300,000,000 which our Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations raised to $400,000,000. There was no deficiency request before the Congress when we wrote up that appropriation bill. There was only a request for three hundred million. The action of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, therefore, and this amendment, if it prevails, will make available for REA a total of $575,000,000 for the servicing of applications which

today aggregate a little ove. $600,000,000. Not all of those have been tested for feasibility; not all of those will be accepted by the REA. But I think at long last we have cleared the decks through the work of our Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations and the good work today of the deficiency committee in bringing this bill to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, a while ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] read from the testimony of Mr. Wickard at page 1284 of the hearings. I want to read some testimony of Mr. Wickard from the same page that the gentleman did not read. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] was questioning Mr. Wickard, and he asked him:

Now, in view of the fact Congress will appropriate that $400,000,000, is it in the best interest of the acceleration of the REA program for us also to appropriate this deficiency of $175,000,000.

Mr. WICKARD. Yes; it will be in the interest of the program.

Mr. MAHON. And what is the reason why?

Mr. WICKARD. Because it will give us money now to keep the program going, and money left over can be used next year and can be used without restrictions in the formula.

Briefly, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] these REA co-ops have to go into the market for the materials and place their orders many, many months in advance in competition with private buyers. They cannot pledge an allocation or make a contract for the delivery of these things unless the money has been actually appropriated and allocated even though it may not be used during the year. So, we are simply handicapping these REA co-ops in keeping their program going continuously by refusing them these appropriations, as was pointed out by Mr. Wickard.

In my own district we have hundreds and hundreds of miles of lines awaiting construction, for which the people have made their deposits and have had them up as much as 2, 2½, and 3 years, waiting for this necessary service. I think we can well afford to add this additional $175,000,000 to keep that program going at full speed. It is doing a great deal for the rural people of our Nation, adding to the development of our Nation, and for the welfare of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I feel that we can be liberal in this appropriation. It is simply an authorization for loans. The record of the REA co-ops is one that may well be followed by other organizations that ask for public funds. They have paid the installments in advance, and in addition they have paid the interest on installments before due. It seems to me that no person should object to seeing to it that the farms of this Nation are electrified. I know the committee has been liberal, but I feel it can be a little more liberal than it has been in this matter. In my State there are 22,000 applications which cannot be considered because, I am informed by the Administration, there are not sufficient funds allotted to that State for them to accept these applications. Let us accept them, especially since so many Members were so liberal when they voted funds for foreign nations.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. The applications for the gentleman's State are a little more than $22,000,000, instead of 22,000.

Mr. LEMKE. Twenty-two thousand applications amounting to $22,000,000.

My State is one of the States least electrified. We are in arrears many millions of dollars, for the reason that during the war no construction was possible. I get letters nearly every day from people who say, "We have had our application in for 5 years and have not had any action on it." So I do hope the Committee will see fit to allow this extra $100,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 77, noes 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Penalty mail costs: For an additional amount for "Penalty mail costs," $35,000.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise only to point out that in this one small item of $35,000 for penalty mail costs, on page 11 of the bill, there are sufficient funds for the rest of thi fiscal year to take care of the fish-marketing reports for the commercial-fishing industry all over the country. I am taking this time only to point out that I called this to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a very short time ago, and he acted very promptly to get this small item in the bill. It will be of immense assistance to the commercial-fishing industry throughout the country.

I am indebted to David Hart, of the Atlantic Fishermen's Union, for bringing this deficiency to my attention and permitting me to correct it.

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD where I offered an amendment in regard to the Veterans' Administration.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system: For an additional amount for "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system," $625,000, to remain available until expended, and to be subject to such limitations and restrictions, except as to operation and maintenance and personal services in the District of Columbia, as may be applicable to appropriations for this purpose in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, or other law and the limitation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system, is increased from "2,500,000" to "$2,600,000," and the limitation under said head on the amount available for personal services in the District of Columbia is increased from "$24,000" to "$24,500": *Provided*, That in addition to the contract authorizations contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, and the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, the Administrator is authorized to contract in the fiscal year 1948 for materials, equipment, and services for power transmission facilities in an amount not in excess of $1,475,000.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, as brought out by my interrogation of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], earlier in the day, this item for the Bonneville Power Administration covers the amount of the budget estimate with the exception of the reduction of $100,000 for operation and maintenance. It includes an appropriation of $625,000 plus contractual authorization in the sum of $1,450,000.

I know those of you who have followed the development of hydroelectric power on the Columbia River realize that these projects have returned to us manyfold the moneys expended on them. As I have often pointed out, approximately one-third of the aluminum produced during World War II came from the Columbia River area, made possible by hydroelectric power developed in these plants. As was recently announced by the Bonneville Power Administration the Bonneville project is repaying the Federal Government for the moneys invested ahead of schedule.

Mr. Chairman, as I remarked on this floor heretofore, the Bonneville Power Administration has recently announced that a special advance payment of $2,100,000 has been made to the account of the Bonneville Dam project. This was good news. It shows that Uncle Sam has a sound investment in the Columbia River Dam projects. I said at that time I intended to call this to the attention of the Appropriations Committees with jurisdiction over these projects when requests for funds for further Northwest resource developments were being considered. I want them to know that their judgment was sound in that funds invested in the Columbia River Basin are gilt-edged.

It is gratifying to know that these great multiple-purpose projects are paying out ahead of the dates which were originally fixed for reimbursing the Federal Government for the moneys invested.

The surplus earnings to date, if continued, will result in a full repayment of the Bonneville Dam project 5 years ahead of schedule. Payments on the Columbia Basin project, namely, Grand Coulee, are also ahead of schedule, thereby making possible pay-out according to schedule despite the increased construction cost of the Grand Coulee facilities.

The Bonneville Dam project, which includes the dam, powerhouses, and accessory facilities constructed and operated by the Corps of Engineers, has, through the fiscal year 1947, received repayment, interest, and operating-ex-

pense credit on the books of the Treasury in the amount of $18,562,150.

About February 10, 1948, an additional advance payment of $2,100,000 was made on the books of the Treasury toward amortizing the cost of the power facilities of the Bonneville Dam project. This was made possible by a request by the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the agreement between the Army Engineers operating the Bonneville Dam and the Bonneville Administration which is marketing the power. This $2,100,000 special additional or advance payment to the account of the Bonneville Dam project was an additional payment over and above the regular pay-out schedule payment of $3,119,850 for the year ending June 30, 1948. This special additional or advance payment was made possible by the fact that the power revenues from the Columbia projects exceed the estimates and are so running as to produce an annual surplus. The payments made from the Bonneville Administration to the Bonneville Dam project exceeded the minimum repayment requirements to the extent that as of January 1, 1948, repayments are $2,252,282 ahead of schedule requirements.

The revenues derived from the sale of power by Bonneville Power Administration, according to statute, are to be used to pay the operating expenses of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Army Engineers operating the Bonneville Dam, and the Bureau of Reclamation operating the Grand Coulee Dam. In addition, out of these revenues are to be paid the annual amortization of the Federal investment in these three agencies and the annual interest charges on the unamortized investment balance. The bookkeeping on these three projects is handled by the Bonneville Power Administration and it is audited annually by independent outside commercial auditors. Based on such an audit is the pay-out schedule showing annual payments to fully cover all the cost items of the Federal investment.

Through the fiscal year 1947 the revenues derived from the sale of power amounted to $101,165,847. These revenues have been and will be deposited with the United States Treasury, and are, and will be, distributed on the books of the Treasury so that the interest and amortization investment account of the power facilities will always show the annual and cumulative contributions toward full interest and capital repayment, as well as meeting annual operating, maintenance and replacement costs.

Power from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams is transmitted over the transmission grid system of the Bonneville Power Administration, which serves the major load centers of the States of Oregon and Washington. The power sales are presently running at an annual rate of about $22,100,000. The additional generators brought in at the Grand Coulee Dam between 1948 and 1952 will increase the annual power revenues to approximately $30,000,000, with total revenues in excess of $270,000,000 during the next 10 years.

These results show what can be accomplished if abundant, firm, and low-cost power is available for resource development.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for their fair treatment of this most worthy project.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Salaries and expenses, Reservation Administration: For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Reservation Administration," including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, $1,000.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. D'EWART: Page 13, after line 16, insert "Emergency work program, Navajo and Hopi Indians: For expenses necessary for administering and carrying out a work program for the Navajo and Hopi Indians, in accordance with the act of December 19, 1947 (Public Law 390), including personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; $1,000,000, to remain available until July 30, 1949."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand that the gentleman has had considerable discussion during the day with the subcommittee handling appropriations for the Department of the Interior and that they have agreed with him on a break-down which I would like to see put into the RECORD at this point as to how this $1,000,000 might be spent.

Mr. D'EWART. That is my intention.

Mr. TABER. So far as I am concerned I do not object to this amendment in this form. I want to say if I may be permitted that I have been terribly disappointed at the performance of the Indian Bureau in connection with this Navajo business and the way they have used the funds out of the relief money to build up personnel, buying automobiles, and things of that kind. I hope we will get better results in the future.

Mr. D'EWART. I might say to the chairman of the committee that we have taken that matter into consideration in going into this request for additional funds for the Hopi and Navajo Indians. I took this matter up with Mr. JENSEN, chairman of the Interior Department Subcommittee, and with Mr. SCHWABE, who is chairman of the Indian Affairs Appropriation Subcommittee. They have agreed on the break-down. I think if this break-down is followed out, it will eliminate the things that you criticize as having happened with the previous appropriations. The break-down is as follows:

Hospital repair and modernization	$100,000
School repair and modernization	100,000
Health activities, hospital facilities, doctors, nurses, etc	100,000
Soil and moisture conservation including fertilizer and irrigation	250,000
Revolving fund for loans and purchase of milk animals	100,000
Road construction and repair	200,000
Expenses necessary in connection with off-reservation work	150,000
Total	1,000,000

I believe if this break-down is followed out the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will not have occasion again to make the criticism that he has just made. This appropriation is in pursuance of the authorization which was voted by the Congress earlier in the year. It is a continuation of the program for which we voted $500,000 earlier in the session. It is a beginning of the long-range program which has recently been sent to the Public Lands Committee for study. We have not had the opportunity of studying that long-range program, but I hope to take it up this month. Every one of the features in this appropriation will be supplemented later by the long-range program. I think it is in the interest of the Navajo and Hopi Indians. I think that this program should be started. I think it is a step in the best interests of the Indians and for the welfare of the Hopi and Navajos.

I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the members of the committee in approving the amount specified in the amendment under consideration. It will carry the Navajos and Hopi Indians over until a more extensive program is arranged for their welfare.

Mr. D'EWART. As chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee I want to express my conviction of the need and my appreciation of the cooperation of the Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Montana: Flathead, $125,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this means to thank the subcommittee on Interior Appropriations for approving an item of $125,000 to extend and construct electrical service lines in the Flathead Indian project area. This will allow sufficient funds to carry forward construction during the remainder of this fiscal year and until additional funds can be provided in the regular 1949 Appropriation Act.

To the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, the Honorable BEN JENSEN, chairman of the subcommittee, to the Honorable IVOR FENTON, the Honorable LOWELL STOCKMAN, the Honorable GEORGE SCHWABE, the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN, ranking minority member, the Honorable WILLIAM NORRELL, and the Honorable ALBERT GORE I want to express the appreciation of the men and women of Montana who will benefit from the consideration and understanding shown by this committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

QUARTERMASTER SERVICE, ARMY

Clothing and equipage: For an additional amount for "Clothing and equipage," $10,000,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 18, strike out lines 1 to 4 inclusive.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I hope it is thoroughly understood that the remarks I will make are in no way disparaging to the members of the Air Force or the exploits which they have already performed and which they may be called upon to perform in the future. I am speaking as a matter of principle.

This proposal contained in these lines involves more than the matter of $10,000,000. You will be told that the thing will be only $2,500,000. That is subject to debate. This is to provide congressional approval for the Air Force to procure and wear light-blue uniforms with chevrons considerably different than those worn in the past by members of the armed forces.

Just a short time ago we passed a bill which called for the unification of the armed services. We anticipated that this action would wipe out some of the jealousies between the branches of the service. I can tell you, with no doubt in my mind, that if this program is adopted, you will have greater division than you have had heretofore. You will have greatly intensified rivalry and jealousy, in view of the fact that the Air Force with its many privileges, including flying pay, already occupies an enviable position. The results to be obtained will not be those claimed by some of its proponents. They point out, of course, that the marines have a separate uniform. Their arguments, as far as logic is concerned, fall absolutely flat.

They tell you that they need this program to increase the morale of the Air Force. Morale? There is no outfit, except possibly the marines, that has a higher morale than the Air Force. That is shown by the fact that in their enlistment program they are now 7,000 above the figure permitted by the budget.

They say that this is necessary to create a greater interest in the Air Force. I do not know how we can have any greater interest, every youngster in America is interested in aviation. If new uniforms are a matter of necessity for building up morale and bringing in more voluntary recruits to the armed forces the place that you need them is in the Ground Forces. Think back to the days of the war and see these doughboys crawling on their bellies in the mud and along the hedgerows of France; in the snow and slush of Germany; fighting their way through the jungles of Pacific islands day after day after day and then spending the night where it overtook them, exhausted, grimy, dirty, hungry. They could not look forward to the fact that when their assignment was over they would be flown back to comfortable beds, warm barracks, hot coffee, good food, clean clothes, and a hot bath. Talk about needed morale and new uniforms! If they are to be furnished now—give them where they will do the most good. Within a very short time, if this program is adopted, the Army is coming in and say they need new uniforms to build up morale. There is no end to the demands. Some day when this Nation and the world is actually at peace, when the treaties have been signed, when we no longer live under armistice conditions, it may be necessary to bring in a program like this to buoy up the Air Force and the Ground Forces. But today that is not needed. If you will read the headlines in today's papers you will find that you may need something more than blue uniforms for the Air Force in a short time. It could happen.

When I think of all the things that are necessary, when I think of all the pleas that are being made to us for planes, new equipment, and everything else, I am certain that this is not the right time to ask the Congress to O. K. or approve a program for new blue uniforms for the Air Force.

This will set up another precedent. The infantry will come in and tell you it is entitled to have new uniforms too, and I would be inclined to agree if we were at peace.

Here is another practical problem: On every air base throughout the world, wherever they are now or may be, you are going to have on that base members of both the Air Force and the ground force. You will have the Air Force in their blue uniforms, black shoes, distinctive caps, shirts, and ties. The Army forces will be in the traditional and glorious OD's. You will have then the problem of distribution. You will have to have the uniforms of two colors instead of one. Unification was designed to simplify procurement and distribution, not complicate it. If there is going to be a need soon, you might as well keep your supply problems as simple as possible, keep both the Army and Air Force in the now available uniforms of the OD. If this change finally takes place there will be one item alone involving $17,000,000 for new overcoats. May I point out to the Air Force that the Marines, even though they have their dress blues, are not ashamed to be seen in their dress blues and their field-green overcoats.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated, this is not in derogation of the Air Force at all. I am proud of them and every American should be proud of them, but this is not the time for frills. We are looking now to a time when we may have many and more difficult jobs ahead of us. If the time is as critical as some have told us it is, and possibly they are right, we need more than new uniforms for the Air Force. We need more planes, more ammunition, more guns, and more men. If Air Force figures on recruiting stand up, if they are getting more than they are permitted certainly their argument that these are needed purely for boosting morale falls down.

Before I close I would like to call attention to the fact that last year in connection with the Army appropriation hearings General Spaatz appeared before us and I asked him specifically if there was any program contemplating putting the Air Force in new blue uniforms. Turn to page 624 of last year's hearings and you will find where General Spaatz stated these words: "We are not giving any consideration to such changes." If he did know the change was proposed he should have told us the truth.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. Is it not a fact that the Air Force is getting so many men now that they have to put them on a quota basis?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Orders went out some time ago to limit recruiting in the Air Force. Of course, those orders in view of proposed increased strength have since been rescinded.

Mr. Chairman, this new uniform is not necessary at all.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to prepare for security, not for show.

The amendment should prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a Member of this House who has a greater interest in the air arms of the military services than I have. I think if we could put the whole kit and kaboodle of them into one uniform, the Government, the people of the United States, and the services themselves would be a great deal better off than they are today. Pride in the uniform is a fine thing, but jealousy between the services is accented by differences between uniforms. Last year we passed the so-called Unification Act. Instead of resulting in unification it has resulted in triplification. Further accent of triplification by establishment of a new color of uniform is, to me, another step away from the unification we need so badly. I am getting a little sick of this old school tie stuff that I have been running into as chairman of the Combat Aviation Submittee of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board. I would like to see them all in the same uniform, perhaps with some little different designation in brass upon the collar. This business of distinguishing between services by different color or cut in uniforms in the United States is going entirely too far. As a matter of fact, if you would put the top brass into civilian clothes and sit them down in one room to argue out their problems, they could come to an agreement an awful lot faster than they can in different uniforms. Therefore, I support this amendment wholeheartedly with the idea that one uniform should ultimately be applied to all services and not different uniforms for each branch of the service.

I have recently introduced a bill, which I believe has gone to the Committee on the Armed Services, to provide for permissive transfer between the services of

all officers in all grades, and I believe that bill, if enacted, will do a great deal to alleviate the present situation in which differences of opinion are so firmly grounded in the separate branches of the armed services. Those differences of opinion would be much better resolved if it were possible for officers to transfer between one branch of the service and another. As a matter of fact, there is a great dearth of experienced officers in the Air Force between the ages of 43 and 53. There is a wide-open space in which naval air officers could go into the Air Force and thereby bring some of the indoctrination which they have received in the Navy Department into the Air Force. It would be a mighty good thing for the Navy and a mighty good thing for the Air Force if that bill were enacted and became law. But so far the Navy Department has opposed it because they are afraid they might lose some officers, forsooth. For goodness sake, if the Navy cannot keep its own officers, with its own attractions and inducements, then they ought to have some of them transferred; but if some of them transfer—and many of them desiring transfer have spoken to me—then there would be some vacancies in the Navy which could be filled by promotion of some of the younger officers, and both the Air Force and the Navy would be better off.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment wholeheartedly, and I hope the appropriation is stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I do not know the origin of the proposal for the blue uniform, but I suppose it had its origin in the fact that the Royal Air Force of England has a distinctive and separate uniform. In World War I, I happened to be in the Marines. I think at the particular age at which I went into the Marines that a great many other boys selected the Marines for the same reason I did. We liked the spirit of the organization. It is possible the uniform contributed to the esprit de corps.

This country is going to be called upon soon for a very substantial increase in its Air Force recruitment. If giving a distinctive uniform will bring boys with the proper spirit into the Air Force I am in favor of them having it.

This proposal does not involve $10,000,000, although the language in the bill might seem to indicate that. It involves $2,500,000. The total cost of the changeover after the adjustment is once made is expected to be $2,500,000. It will cost initially a little bit more, for dyeing of cloth and getting up a stock of goods, but that will simply increase the total number of uniforms, olive drab and blue, that will be on hand initially.

The cloth will be the same; in fact, they are going to use some of the olive drab on hand and simply dye it blue. The air officers testified that the blue would spot less from oil and grease than the OD which turns black.

There is a reason for deciding the matter at this time, one way or the other. The idea has been widely discussed. Officers who need new uniforms have been hesitant as to whether they should buy some new OD uniforms or buy blue if that is to be the official color. The matter should be settled one way or the other.

I hope you will support the request of the Air Force that they be given this lift for the recruiting that is immediately ahead of them, and support the committee by rejecting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I am like the gentleman from California. I do not think anyone can say I am not in favor of a strong Air Force, because last November I introduced the Air Supremacy Act to build up our Air Force immediately and to appropriate $5,000,000,000 for that purpose. But I have been tied up with the armed services in some way since I was 17 years old. We have to consider, when we are thinking about the morale of the Air Force, the morale of the other branches of the service. It seems to me that about the worst thing we can do is buy some distinctive fancy new uniforms for the Air Force alone at this time. I am in favor of the proposition stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] to give them all some new uniforms but the same kind of uniform. So I hope the Committee will support the amendment. I certainly expect to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I too am not in favor of the Government buying fancy new uniforms for the Air Force. That is not the question. The question is a very simple one. It was necessary to place orders for additional uniforms, but before those orders were placed it was desired that a change be made in the Air Force uniform, not the material. The identical material used for the Army uniform will be used for the Air Force. There will simply be a change in the color. I cannot see any reason why this should not be done. The Navy has its uniform, and so do the Marine Corps, and the Army. Each branch of the service has its uniform. Why should not the Air Force have its uniform? Either all branches of the service should have the same uniform, and there is some argument for such a policy, or else this request of the Air Force should be approved. I am surprised at the objections which have been made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ENGEL of Michigan) there were—ayes 72, noes 48.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read and open for amendment or points of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to that on this side.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to be made to the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, probably the only serious difference of opinion that is yet to be resolved is that in regard to the appropriation of the full $175,000,000 recommended by the Budget for the REA. There will be a motion to recommit based upon this $100,000,000 increase for REA. It will be offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the ranking minority member of the committee. All of those who want to give REA the loan funds it must have to meet the needs of our rural people will want to support that motion. I feel that this group should include members of the minority party as well as Democrats. In fact it will be necessary for them to vote for this motion in order to carry out the statements already made in all good faith.

Many members of the majority have publicly stated, and honestly and seriously stated, that the majority party of this House has raised the budget estimate for REA by $100,000,000. I know that just recently some of my Republican colleagues who went on the trip with the Agriculture Committee through various sections of the country made the repeated statement that the majority party had increased the budget estimate for REA by $100,000,000.

This was entirely in order. It was a proper and understandable statement. I offer no criticism. I know that these statements were made in good faith and I am sure that that good faith will be vindicated by the vote we will take in a few minutes. At the time these statements were made they were thought to be true.

They will still be true if we adopt this motion to recommit. If we do not adopt it we will, I am sure, greatly embarrass some of our colleagues. I do not think the House wants to put the Members who made those statements in a false light.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield briefly.

Mr. LECOMPTE. In the agriculture appropriation bill which we passed a couple of weeks ago, we had an item for REA of $400,000,000.

Mr. POAGE. We had a budget estimate of $300,000,000 in connection with the regular appropriation bill. The committee raised that to $400,000,000, which made an increase of $100,000,000 in that item in the regular appropriation bill for the fiscal year of 1949. But at the same time, not after, but before we voted on that, we had a budget estimate of $175,000,000 for a similar item for REA loans in the deficiency bill. The gentlemen will recall that back in February when the urgent deficiency bill was before this House I stated that I intended to ask for additional funds for REA when this bill was brought up. The gentleman from Mississippi actually offered an amendment to the first deficiency bill, which was defeated by only 20 votes. Everyone was on notice that REA was to seek more money in this bill. The budget sent its estimate for this deficiency item to the House before the regular bill was passed.

At the time the regular bill was passed the total budget request for the balance

of the 1948 fiscal year and for the fiscal year of 1949 totaled $475,000,000. In the regular 1949 appropriation the House gave $400,000,000. This lacked, and still lacks, $75,000,000 of equalling the total amount requested by the budget. As this bill now stands it, taken together with the regular 1949 bill, would give $475,000,000 for REA loans during the balance of the fiscal year of 1948 and during the fiscal year of 1949. That is exactly the total recommended by the budget. It is not the $100,000,000 increase which many majority Members have said this House was giving. The only way we can provide that extra $100,000,000 is to pass the motion to recommit.

Unless you adopt this motion to recommit you leave many of your colleagues in the position of having unintentionally deceived the country, of having misled the public. I know the majority Members of this House do not want to do that. If you want to keep faith with the public, and I know you do, if you want to make good on the claim that you have given the REA $100,000,000 more than the budget recommended, then vote for this motion to recommit because it is the only way you can make those statements stand up. I want to see this House act fairly with the people. I know my Republican colleagues want to see the majority of this House keep faith with the people and do what we said we were going to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my constituents and myself, as well as for the citizens and taxpayers of other States, I wish to thank the committee chairman and members for the consideration given and the decisions reached in regard to the utilization of surplus farm and canned products in item "Government and relief in occupied areas" under the bill under consideration (H. R. 6055) and as established in colloquy between the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], who preceded me. We are satisfied that the mandate of the committee and of this Congress will now be carried out in respect to the purchase of the surplus farm and agricultural products stated in the hearings on this bill.

So there will be no further misunderstanding of this matter, I wish to quote from page 852 of the hearings a statement of the foods and the amounts of same that are agreed upon by the Army and directed to be utilized in this program by the committee, as follows:

Commodity	Total program per justification using nearest 1,000-ton figure	Procured or procurable with already appropriated funds	Shipments [1] July 1, 1947, to Feb. 29, 1948	Expenditures, fiscal year 1948 funds only, from July 1, 1947, to Feb. 29, 1948 [2]	Additional to be procured with funds now requested
GERMANY					
		Net long tons	*Net long tons*		*Net long tons*
Bread grains and flour	3,226,000	[3] 2,672,000	[1] 2,133,662		554,000
Fats and oils	116,000	116,000	35,546		0
Soya flour	101,000	101,000	8,163		0
Peas and beans	94,000	84,000	22,423		10,000
Sugar	520,000	351,000	134,738		169,000
Dried skim milk	45,000	45,000	34,841		0
Potatoes	190,000	190,000	103,839		0
Fish	180,000	180,000	46,695		0
Dried fruit	157,000	157,000	31,696		0
Dried eggs	8,350	8,350	0		0
Dried soup mixes	25,000	0	0		25,000
Canned sweetpotatoes	26,000	0	0		26,000
Miscellaneous foods	31,000	31,000	23,772		0
Total	4,719,350	3,935,350	2,575,375	[4] $207,216,276	784,000
JAPAN					
Bread grains and flour	1,123,000	931,000	[1] 779,011		192,000
Copra	37,000	37,000	19,600		0
Soybeans	58,000	58,000	7,565		0
Peas and beans	77,000	77,000	54,543		0
Soya flour	147,000	147,000	100,283		0
Soybean meal	41,000	41,000	0		0
Sugar	500,000	308,000	208,121		192,000
Dried skim milk	34,000	34,000	16,011		0
Dried prunes	20,411	20,411	9,679		0
Miscellaneous foods	15,266	15,266	29,506		0
Total	2,052,677	1,668,677	1,223,319	[4] 106,337,292	384,000
KOREA					
Bread grains and flour	235,000	205,000	[1] 168,060		30,000
Rice	50,000	50,000	12,586		0
Sugar	58,000	25,000	16,381		33,000
Soya flour	8,000	8,000	8,019		0
Total	351,000	288,000	205,046	[4] 9,715,007	63,000
Grand total	7,123,027	5,892,027	[1] 4,003,740	[2] 323,268,575	1,231,000

[1] Excludes July 1947 shipments of bread grains.
[2] These figures do not include either (1) the $85,000,000 spent from fiscal year 1947 funds for foods constituting part of the fiscal year 1948 food program as set forth in the justifications; nor (2) the $100,000,000 (approximate figure) of fiscal year 1947 funds expended for grain shipments during July 1947 which were treated as part of the fiscal year 1947 program.
[3] Includes 57,000 tons Soviet grain not bought with appropriated funds.
[4] Figures are estimates only.

Mr. Chairman, I am advised that under this specific item in the appropriation under discussion, and under the table hereinabove outlined that there is set aside the sum of $2,437,000, for the purchase of canned sweetpotatoes, and I again state for the RECORD that I understand that it is the directive of the Committee and this Congress that a fair and reasonable price, as near as possible to the cost of production or processing shall be paid to our people by the Army for the canned sweetpotatoes, as well as all of the other agricultural products stated in the table presented.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleagues, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] and myself, who have worked with Mr. TABER and the Army officials in this matter, I wish to again thank Mr. TABER for the fine cooperation and assistance given in helping our people to include these foods in this program, and thereby save the loss of these fine and valuable foods, as well as making a contribution to the general economy of our country.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, unless there are some amendments to be offered I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

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 (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CANNON. I am, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with an amendment as follows:

On page 10, line 7, strike out "$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$400,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 154, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—199

Abernethy
Albert
Allen, La.
Almond
Andersen, H. Carl
Angell
Arnold
Banta
Barden
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Bennett, Mich
Bennett, Mo.
Blatnik
Boggs, La.
Bonner
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Bulwinkle
Burke
Burleson
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carroll
Carson
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cole, Mo.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Courtney
Cravens
Crosser
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Deane
Dolliver
Donohue
Dorn
Doughton
Douglas
Durham
Eberharter
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Gary
Gathings
Gillette
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Gregory
Griffiths
Hagen
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hays
Hedrick
Hobbs
Hoeven
Holifield
Hope
Horan
Huber
Hull
Isacson
Jackson, Wash.
Jenkins, Ohio
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Tex.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten, Mo.
Kee
Kefauver
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Landis
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Latham
Lemke
Lucas
Lusk
Lyle
Lynch
McCormack
McCowen
McCulloch
McGregor
McMillan, S. C.
MacKinnon
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Merrow
Meyer
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Monroney
Morris
Morrison
Multer
Mundt
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Norblad
Norton
O'Konski
Pace
Patman
Peden
Peterson
Philbin
Phillips, Tenn.
Pickett
Poage
Potter
Powell
Preston
Price, Fla.
Price, Ill.
Priest
Ramey
Rankin
Rayburn
Redden
Regan
Rich
Riley
Rivers
Robertson
Rogers, Fla.
Sadowski
Sasscer
Schwabe, Mo.
Sheppard
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Smathers
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Somers
Spence
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stigler
Talle
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Trimble
Vinson
Vursell
Walter
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Williams
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wood
Worley
Zimmerman

NAYS—154

Allen, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, N. Y.
Arends
Auchincloss
Bakewell
Bates, Mass.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bradley
Bramblett
Brophy
Brown, Ohio
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Chadwick
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Crawford
Crow
Dague
Dawson, Utah
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dondero
Elliott
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fellows
Fenton
Fletcher
Foote
Fuller
Fulton
Gallagher
Gamble
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillie
Goff
Goodwin
Graham
Grant, Ind.
Gross
Gwinn, N. Y.
Gwynne, Iowa
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harvey
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Holmes
Javits
Jenison
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Keating
Keefe
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Knutson
Kunkel
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lewis
Lodge
McConnell
McDonough
McDowell
McGarvey
McMahon
Mack
Maloney
Mathews
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Mitchell
Morton
Muhlenberg
Nicholson
Nixon
Nodar
O'Brien
O'Hara
Patterson
Phillips, Calif.
Plumley
Potts
Poulson
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Riehlman
Rockwell
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Schwabe, Okla.
Scoblick
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Smith, Maine
Smith, Ohio
Snyder
Stockman
Taber
Tibbott
Tollefson
Towe
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vorys
Wadsworth
Welchel
Welch
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Woodruff
Youngblood

NOT VOTING—78

Abbitt
Allen, Ill.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, Ala.
Beall
Bell
Bender
Bland
Bloom
Boykin
Buck
Buckley
Buffett
Busbey
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chapman
Clippinger
Coffin
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Cox
Dawson, Ill.
Delaney
Dingell
Dirksen
Domengeaux
Eaton
Fallon
Garmatz
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Harless, Ariz.
Harness, Ind.
Hartley
Hébert
Heffernan
Hendricks
Hoffman
Jackson, Calif.
Jarman
Jenkins, Pa.
Jennings
Jones, Wash.
Kearns
Lesinski
Lichtenwalter
Love
Ludlow
McMillen, Ill.
Macy
Madden
Manasco
Mason
Meade, Ky.
Meade, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Morgan
Norrell
O'Toole
Owens
Passman
Pfeifer
Ploeser
Rains
Richards
Rizley
Rooney
Sabath
Scott, Hardie
Shafer
Sikes
Simpson, Pa.
Stratton
Sundstrom
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
West

So the bill was recommitted.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Andrews of Alabama for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.

Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. Buck against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Sundstrom against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Lichtenwalter against.

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Richards for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Hendricks for, with Mr. Case of New Jersey against.

Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Abbitt for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. West with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Buffett.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Clippinger.

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Coffin.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Bland with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.

Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Meade of Kentucky.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Love.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Jones of Washington.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Busbey.

Mr. Granger with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. Manasco with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Ludlow with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Owens.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Bender.

Mr. MICHENER, Mr. ELLIS, and Mr. BRADLEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CARSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the instructions of the House, I report the bill back with an amendment which is at the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 7, strike out "$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$400,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 339, nays 4, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—339

Abernethy
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, La.
Almond
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Auchincloss
Bakewell
Banta
Barden
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beckworth
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Blatnik
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolton
Bonner
Bradley
Bramblett
Brehm
Brooks
Brophy
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Buchanan
Bulwinkle
Burke
Burleson
Butler
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carson
Case, S. Dak.
Celler
Chadwick
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clark
Clason
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Courtney
Cravens
Crawford
Crosser
Crow
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Dorn
Doughton
Douglas
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Feighan
Fellows
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Flannagan
Fletcher
Fogarty
Folger
Foote
Forand
Fuller
Fulton
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillette
Gillie
Goff
Goodwin
Gordon
Gorski
Gossett
Graham
Grant, Ind.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gwinn, N. Y.
Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Hardy
Harless, Ariz.
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Harvey
Havenner
Hays
Hedrick
Herter

Heselton	McMillan, S. C.	Rogers, Mass.
Hill	Mack	Rohrbough
Hinshaw	MacKinnon	Ross
Hobbs	Mahon	Russell
Hoeven	Maloney	Sadlak
Holifield	Mansfield	Sadowski
Holmes	Marcantonio	Sanborn
Hope	Martin, Iowa	Sarbacher
Horan	Mathews	Sasscer
Huber	Merrow	Schwabe, Mo.
Hull	Meyer	Schwabe, Okla.
Isacson	Michener	Scoblick
Jackson, Wash.	Miller, Calif.	Scott,
Javits	Miller, Md.	Hugh D., Jr.
Jenison	Mills	Scrivner
Jenkins, Ohio	Mitchell	Seely-Brown
Jensen	Monroney	Sheppard
Johnson, Calif.	Morris	Short
Johnson, Ill.	Morrison	Simpson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.	Morton	Simpson, Pa.
Johnson, Okla.	Muhlenberg	Smathers
Johnson, Tex.	Multer	Smith, Kans.
Jones, Ala.	Mundt	Smith, Maine
Jones, N. C.	Murdock	Smith, Va.
Jonkman	Murray, Tenn.	Smith, Wis.
Judd	Murray, Wis.	Snyder
Karsten, Mo.	Nicholson	Somers
Kean	Nixon	Spence
Kearney	Nodar	Stanley
Keating	Norton	Stefan
Kee	O'Brien	Stevenson
Keefe	O'Hara	Stigler
Kefauver	O'Konski	Stockman
Kelley	Pace	Taber
Kennedy	Patman	Talle
Keogh	Patterson	Teague
Kerr	Peden	Thomas, Tex.
Kersten, Wis.	Peterson	Thompson
Kilday	Philbin	Tibbott
King	Phillips, Calif.	Tollefson
Kirwan	Phillips, Tenn.	Trimble
Klein	Pickett	Twyman
Knutson	Ploeser	Vail
Kunkel	Plumley	Van Zandt
Landis	Poage	Vorys
Lane	Potter	Vursell
Lanham	Potts	Wadsworth
Larcade	Poulson	Walter
Lea	Powell	Weichel
LeCompte	Preston	Welch
LeFevre	Price, Fla.	Wheeler
Lemke	Price, Ill.	Whitten
Lewis	Ramey	Whittington
Lodge	Rankin	Wigglesworth
Lucas	Rayburn	Williams
Lusk	Redden	Wilson, Ind.
Lyle	Reed, Ill.	Wilson, Tex.
Lynch	Reed, N. Y.	Winstead
McConnell	Rees	Wolcott
McCormack	Reeves	Wolverton
McCowen	Regan	Wood
McCulloch	Riehlman	Woodruff
McDonough	Riley	Worley
McDowell	Rivers	Youngblood
McGarvey	Robertson	Zimmerman
McGregor	Rockwell	
McMahon	Rogers, Fla.	

NAYS—4

Gross	Miller, Conn.	Towe
Kilburn		

NOT VOTING—88

Abbitt	Engle, Calif.	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Evins	Meade, Ky.
Andresen,	Fallon	Meade, Md.
August H.	Gallagher	Miller, Nebr.
Andrews, Ala.	Garmatz	Morgan
Beall	Gore	Norblad
Bell	Granger	Norrell
Bender	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Bland	Harness, Ind.	Owens
Bloom	Hartley	Passman
Boykin	Hébert	Pfeifer
Buck	Heffernan	Priest
Buckley	Hendricks	Rains
Buffett	Hess	Rich
Busbey	Hoffman	Richards
Carroll	Jackson, Calif.	Rizley
Case, N. J.	Jarman	Rooney
Chapman	Jenkins, Pa.	Sabath
Clippinger	Jennings	St. George
Coffin	Jones, Wash.	Scott, Hardie
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Latham	Sikes
Cox	Lesinski	Smith, Ohio
Davis, Tenn.	Lichtenwalter	Stratton
Dawson, Ill.	Love	Sundstrom
Delaney	Ludlow	Taylor
Dingell	McMillen, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Macy	Vinson
Domengeaux	Madden	West
Eaton	Manasco	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Priest with Mr. Case of New Jersey.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Meade of Kentucky.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Love.
Mr. West with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Jones of Washington.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Clippinger.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Carroll with Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Manasco with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Norrell with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVERY COUNTRY BUT OUR OWN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, by an overwhelming vote, the House decided to extend aid to foreign governments for the purpose, it was said, of stopping communism and preventing our own destruction by Stalin and the Russians.

Years ago, a fighting American announced that this Government of ours had billions for defense but not 1 cent for tribute.

But confidence in constitutional government, in the ability, courage, and endurance of our own people seems to belong to the horse and buggy days.

The program adopted yesterday, whether the people know it or not, is unlimited as to amount or time. The debate in the Senate and in the House shows conclusively that $17,000,000,000 is not the total that will be asked and, unless the people halt it, given. A distinguished Member of the Senate, a proponent of the plan, during the debate stated that, with the passage of the bill, this country was morally obligated to following through. He did not say for how long. Nor does the plan end with the gift of money and supplies. Already we have sent military men as advisers to Greece and Turkey—doubtless to other countries.

Our gifts of money and materials, some of which are going to governments which will shortly turn at least a portion of them over to our potential enemy, Russia, and our military men will be followed by our Air Force, Navy, and Army unless the people call a halt.

Those supporting this plan do not tell us that it will avoid war. The most they will predict is that it may avoid war—that it is a calculated risk.

Having listened to the debates in both House and Senate just prior to World War II, my conclusion is that we are today following the same road we followed then. You will undoubtedly recall that the Congress made many appropriations, extended aid in many ways, to Great Britain in order to avoid war. You have not forgotten that Churchill told us that, if we would give Great Britain the tools, she would do the job.

Nor have you forgotten—at least you should not have forgotten—that when we went into the war he made the statement in substance and to the effect that that was the day he had been hoping and praying for.

We let ourselves be led into World War II. If we follow the administration and the propagandists, the passage of this Marshall plan will lead us into another war.

War is not inevitable if we choose to avoid it. Stalin is not going to come to America to fight a war.

Beyond question he intends to take over those countries which border on his own land. In my judgment, he is taking the things which Roosevelt and Churchill promised he should have. To date, the American public has not been able to learn how much nor what Roosevelt and Churchill conceded to Stalin in their various conferences. Nor does anyone know what concessions Truman made. The American people are entitled to a transcript of all the conversations and agreements entered into by Stalin on the one side and either Roosevelt, Churchill, or Truman on the other.

Already, under the authority granted by the unification bill, which was forced through our committee by our leaders and into which I endeavored to write some safeguards, the military are taking over and regimenting our natural resources and our industries.

Nor is that all. The next step is the bill for compulsory universal military training. It is proposed to establish here in America the same system used by Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini, and which failed when put to the test.

Compulsory military training will be followed by a drive to conscript the young men and probably the young women of this land to fight another war.

With the war will come again scarcity, high prices, price fixing, and regimentation.

In short, to sum it all up, the proposition is that we force Stalin to get out of those countries which are adjacent to Russia, that we give those countries, and all others throughout the world, what some are pleased to describe as democracy—which, let us assume, they mean is equivalent to the freedom of action which we have here. We bleed ourselves white, we crack wide open our national defense in a futile effort to extend democracy abroad, and in return we get here at home price fixing, rationing, which adds up to regimentation which always means a dictator.

Without a war scare, Truman has no hope of reelection.

Without a war scare, those in the military service will be unable to destroy individual freedom, the American way of living and doing business.

Not so long ago the question in many minds was whether, following the New

Deal, we would have a labor or a military government. At the moment, it seems as though labor were losing, the military gaining, control.

The American people were twice, by ambitious politicans, led into war and 100 years of work and thrift by taxpaying Americans will not cancel the monetary cost.

The moral and spiritual loss caused by these two wars, and by those who were responsible for them, will darken the lives of future generations for—no one knows how long.

From the Chicago Tribune of March 31 comes an editorial captioned, "Later than you think," which reads as follows:

LATER THAN YOU THINK

The newspaper headlines, the radio babble, the urgent, solemn, and sometimes rather frantic statements of leaders, are all suggestive of 1941. There is an ominous parallel in demands for the immediate build-up of vast military force, with the assurance that, of course, this power is to enforce a will for peace, not to get the United States into war. That is what we were told last time.

Every prudent instinct warns that this is a maneuvered crisis. The Tribune has seen it coming for a long time. Almost alone among the newspapers of the country we warned of the rise of a dangerous militarist party in America when the so-called service unification bill, with all of its totalitarian apparatus, was thrust on Congress last year as must legislation.

We saw the lines of conflict being drawn for another war even before that when Mr. Truman enunciated his doctrine of stopping Russia at the borders of Greece and Turkey. Two world wars had convinced us of the tragic folly of trying to order the world to our design through use of force at ruinous moral and material expense. Crusades against tyranny abroad have only brought totalitarianism closer at home. We can't cheer another one when, once more, our security is not jeopardized by distant events.

It seems plain that this rigged crisis grows out of Truman's political desperation. He has become the captive of the powerful militaristic faction in his administration. The assertion of a foreign menace is necessary to provide them with the men, the money, the weapons, and the dominance over the Nation that they seek. It will also enhance his prestige by giving him the opportunity to play the strong man in resisting world communism, as convenient a bete noire as Hitlerism was for his predecessor. He has lost political control at home; there is a long chance that he can recapture it by military adventurism abroad.

This policy has its accustomed charm to the same internationalist elements which whipped up the war fever of 1940–41 by playing on the Nation's fears. The propaganda mechanisms of that period are being dusted off again. Although nothing developed out of World War II, according to the prophecies of these alarmists, they are back unabashed, telling us once more what we should do.

There are the same voices, the same scares, the same arguments. Here is Joseph C. Grew, Roosevelt's Ambassador to Japan, saying, "We cannot afford to face some future day when America will stand alone." We were told that in 1941. Here is Mrs. Roosevelt, saying that it is "inconsistent to cut taxes" because "the preparation on which we and other democratic nations are now embarked will be financed completely by the United States." These are echoes from the past: lend-lease all over again and our friends, the "peace-loving democracies," among which Mrs. Roosevelt used to reckon the present presumptive adversary.

Here is Dr. Isaiah Bowman, president of Johns Hopkins University and an architect of the United Nations, proclaiming: "This is not a time of peace. * * * What mountains of evidence must yet be piled up before the people of the United States realize that we are even now at war?" So the war is not ahead of us. It is here now.

A President and a war party that start playing the dangerous game of seeking political advantage and power in a threat of war will find in the outcome that they have carried their countrymen into irretrievable conflict. Step by step, a little at a time, they advance. Once started, they can't turn back.

The militarists know where they are headed. Truman may know. To the people, bewildered by the drumfire of propaganda and rendered victim to secret maneuvering, it is a confusing mystery. The Pearl Harbor investigation disclosed the technique after the last war was over. Are we in for another future inquest, showing again how the executive branch of the Government betrayed the people into war? We are, unless the people and Congress apprehend this sinister pattern in time. It should be familiar to them by now.

Truly it is later than you think, but the people of America still have one opportunity to rescue their Government from the politically ambitious, the over-fearful, the screwy thinking, the do-gooders who never seem to learn nor to accept realities. Unless next November the people elect a President who believes in our form of government, who has faith in the ability and courage of our people, we will be in a world war.

I am fearful that unless, before that election, Senators and Congressmen hear from their home folks, those Senators and Congressmen will so far commit us into the hands of the ambitious war-minded leaders of Europe and Asia that it will be impossible to avoid war. If the home folks do not want scarcities and all that scarcities mean; if they do not want bureaucratic price fixing and rationing; if they do not want a horde of little dictators telling them every day what to eat, what to wear, and what to do, they should without delay make their wishes known to their chosen representatives in Congress.

Yesterday there was hoisted over the Capitol in Washington the red flag of danger and the yellow flag of fear—the first, without reason, the second, without justification.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an analysis of the tax bill which will probably be before us tomorrow. I have analyzed the bill in question-and-answer form for the use of the membership of the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. MARCANTONIO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper articles.

LEASING OF STATE LANDS FOR PRODUCTION OF OIL, GAS, AND OTHER HYDROCARBONS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4167) to authorize the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington to lease their State lands for the production of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons for such terms of years and on such conditions as may be from time to time provided by the legislative assembly of the respective States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 6, strike out all after "amended" where it appears the second time down to and including "States"." in line 12 and insert "to read as follows: 'Except as otherwise provided herein, the said lands may be leased under such regulations as the legislature may prescribe. Leases for the production of minerals, including leases for exploration for oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons and the extraction thereof, shall be for such term of years and on such conditions as may be from time to time provided by the legislatures of the respective States; leases for grazing and agricultural purposes shall be for a term not longer than 10 years; and leases for development of hydroelectric power shall be for a term not longer than 50 years.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington to lease their State lands for production of minerals, including leases for exploration for oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons and the extraction thereof, for such terms of years and on such conditions as may be from time to time provided by the legislatures of the respective States."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD in the deficiency appropriation bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks and insert a statement in regard to the history of Missouri, despite the fact that it will require an additional page in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Harley J. Credicott, of Freeport, Ill.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 45 minutes.

FLOODS ON THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour I will make my remarks very brief. I do want, however, to point out that I intend to take 45 minutes sometime next week because I desire to cover a subject which is of the utmost importance to my own district. It has to do with the flooding of the Susquehanna River, which last week overflowed its banks and caused death and disaster to the western part of Broome County in the vicinity of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y. It is my objective to talk on the bill which I am introducing today which will call upon Congress in this emergency to authorize $1,000,000 for the start of the building of flood walls on each side of the Susquehanna River in the Endicott-Johnson City-Vestal area.

I hope the House will give sympathetic attention to this grave matter because, as I have said, it has resulted in death and destruction to the extent of about half a million dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next and on Thursday next I may on each date address the House for 45 minutes following the disposition of the business of the day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 20 minutes.

A BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, international relations are deteriorating at an amazing and an alarming rate. The Soviet Union is pushing a program of brazen, sinister, and ruthless expansion. The Kremlin, by its philosophy and by its actions, is clearly demonstrating that world domination is the ultimate Russian objective.

The interests of the United States are global. Our security and our survival are at stake. It is imperative for us to state our foreign policy concisely, clearly, and firmly so that there can be no misunderstanding as to our determination to establish a decent society and to guarantee world peace.

Failure to clearly set forth our position before the outbreak of two world wars resulted in a most costly experience for the United States. Failure to prepare ourselves adequately for any international emergency and failure to realize that any future war in which we may be involved will cost us dearly in material resources and human lives. By being utterly realistic in facing present disturbing world conditions we will be able to take the steps necessary to avert a third world war.

THE NATIONAL CONVENTIONS

In June and July the Republicans and the Democrats will hold their national conventions. They will write platforms and nominate candidates for the Presidency. In this uncertain, complex, and strife-ridden world international issues are becoming of increasing significance to every American citizen. It would be most salutary, most effective, most beneficial, and most heartening to the American people if the conventions would adopt an identical bipartisan foreign policy platform. It would be an announcement that the United States faces the world with a solid united front. It would be clearly understood that we intend to approach international issues in bipartisan unity and not in partisan dissension. A realistic bipartisan platform on foreign policy should include planks incorporating the following principles:

PROPOSED PRINCIPLES FOR PLANKS IN A BIPARTISAN PLATFORM ON FOREIGN POLICY

First. The United States should firmly dedicate itself and all its resources to the maintenance of its destiny-given position of leadership for world peace. This Republic was brought into being for the prime purpose of laying the foundations for a just and permanent peace. Every American heart must be devoted to the achievement of this objective. All the energy, all the ability, and all the statesmanship we possess must be employed for the realization of this goal.

Second. Congress should appoint immediately a select committee to conduct a thorough study of international relations and to carry out a searching investigation of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. Such procedure would give the Members of Congress a more potent voice in the development and in the implementation of foreign policy.

Third. The United States must continue to exercise leadership in the establishment of a real, workable, and effective world organization. The defects of the UN, chief of which is the veto, must be removed. If this cannot be accomplished and if the Kremlin continues in its refusal to cooperate, we must abandon the UN and form at once a new international organization of liberty-loving democratic states without the presence of the impeding Soviet Union.

Fourth. Diplomatic appeasement of the Soviet Union in which we have been indulging since the end of the war must cease. Diplomatic appeasement failed in the 1930's. It has failed in the 1940's. It leads only to conflict.

Fifth. Economic assistance to rehabilitate the economies of countries resisting the spread of communism and the drive of Russian aggression must be continued by the United States. An admirable beginning has been made in the passage of ERP. As long as aid to free nations is effective in checking the advance of the Soviet Union and in preventing the spread of communism, we must continue whether it be for 1, 4, 5, or 10 years.

In extending aid, we should constantly demand that the nations who receive assistance help themselves. As soon as they are self-supporting, have successfully liquidated the sinister spread of communism and strengthened themselves militarily, our aid can be greatly diminished or entirely ceased. We help guarantee our security by strengthening those who are resisting the march of Mr. Stalin and his politbureau.

Sixth. If a democratic country, threatened by a Communist minority within, which is either directly or indirectly aided, abetted, and controlled by the Kremlin, asks aid of the United States, assistance should be extended, be it economic or military.

Seventh. The United States should inform the world and particularly the Soviet Union that we intend to use our force to stop aggression directed at strategic points such as the approaches to the Atlantic, Gibraltar, the countries of western Europe, the Dardanelles, Greece, Turkey, Iran, the Near East, the Persian Gulf area, China, and the islands of the Pacific. We should state clearly that whenever there is encroachment on these areas, or any other strategic positions, the integrity of which we deem essential to the security and the survival of the United States, the power making such an encroachment will meet with our immediate, sustained, and unrelenting resistance. We should for our own self-interest and the peace of the world establish a line beyond which an aggressor may not move without encountering the full force and power of the United States.

Eighth. Most important of all planks in a realistic, bipartisan program on foreign policy is the achievement and the maintenance of adequate preparedness on the sea, on the land, and more especially in the air. Atomic supremacy and air supremacy by the United States must be realized at all costs.

United States air supremacy is the only road to world peace. All the funds required to keep us the strongest military nation on the planet should be unhesitatingly appropriated by the Congress. Having done this, the Congress should insist that the armed services efficiently and effectively move to an early and full realization of this determined objective.

Legislation to provide full and adequate manpower for the armed services should be enacted at once.

WAR OR PEACE

I am convinced that the proposed principles on United States foreign policy which I have outlined should be adopted as a program by both parties at their conventions in June and July and should be incorporated in their platforms.

A weak foreign policy, an unrealistic foreign policy, a fragmentary foreign policy, a vacillating foreign policy, a foreign policy of appeasement will lead us only to destruction, to war, to slavery, and to death.

A strong foreign policy, a resolute foreign policy, a firm foreign policy, a realistic foreign policy, a foreign policy dedicated to world freedom backed by the armed might of the United States

will guarantee a free world, a peaceful world, a world in which nations can live without fear of intimidation, of aggression, of slavery, and of ultimate annihilation.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

EDWARD U. CONDON

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, despite the lateness of the hour, the Committee on Un-American Activities has a matter it has thought wise to bring before the House. We have carefully waited until the European recovery plan was disposed of. We feel now, however, that the matter should be discussed.

On March 1 of this year a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities issued a statement in which was named the Director of the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce, Edward U. Condon. A member of that subcommittee, the very able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL] has prepared a statement that I feel the House will be greatly interested in hearing. I therefore yield at this point such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL].

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, throughout recent weeks the Committee on Un-American Activities has been the target of continuous vicious attacks by various organizations and individuals as well as by certain Members of this body, few in number, it is true, but blatantly vocal and chronically unsympathetic to the aims and objectives of the committee and as chronically blind to its accomplishments.

The very nature of the assignment entrusted to the committee to keep the Congress informed of subversive activities affecting the security of our country is sufficient of itself to draw the fire of those whose interests lie in establishing and maintaining a curtain of secrecy concealing the movements of organizations and individuals who seek to destroy our Government—a curtain that has been thrown aside times without number by the committee and its investigators, permitting the scorching glare of publicity to sear and wither the well-laid plans of our enemies.

It is the penalty of service on the committee to be reviled and blasphemed by persons and groups sympathetic to the aims of the Soviet Union, by so-called Liberals and by weaklings who have been influenced by communistic propaganda. That penalty we accept in good grace in the knowledge that were we less effective we would not be so cordially hated by those elements.

It is my very great honor to be a member of your Committee on Un-American Activities, and I have a keen appreciation of the important responsibilities that such a membership entails. I was and I am deeply gratified by my appointment to that committee since selection to serve thereon implied the confidence of our leadership in my judgment, general capacity, and patriotism.

I am now serving my second year and I have come to know well my associates on that committee and I have conceived a very great measure of respect for each of them and all of them, Republican and Democrat alike, for the intensity of their devotion to their country, for their high intelligence, for the wisdom of their decisions, for their temperate self-control in the face of epithet and insult hurled from the witness chair, and for the uniformly wholehearted cooperation and the fine esprit de corps that has characterized the committee throughout my period of service.

We have been described as bug-eyed witch hunters, vilified and excoriated as intent upon destruction of individual liberties, but I submit to you that, on the contrary, the members of the committee individually and collectively are conservative, conscientious, and possessed of a rare degree of calm, deliberate judgment and common sense, and their unceasing efforts are concentrated upon the preservation of every right guaranteed to American citizens under the Constitution.

Its members have been accused of using the committee as a springboard to publicity. Let me point out that considering its potentiality for press interest the committee has been exceptionally reserved and the majority of its members are rarely quoted or even mentioned in the press in connection with committee activities.

Your committee has been patient and tolerant of unfair criticisms from the floor in the light of their sources and in the knowledge that complete vindication of its acts awaited only the opportunity for formal presentation of the evidence in its possession.

It should not be necessary to defend the committee or its actions since the past record reflects the fact that the committee has without exception been sustained in its findings by preponderant vote of the House and subsequently by court decisions.

It would seem in the light of these facts that the committee has earned your confidence—at least to the extent that judgment be withheld until the full facts are made known in public hearing.

However, we take the floor today, departing from precedent, because there appears to be some question in the minds of Members who have consistently indicated their confidence in the committee as to whether or not, at long last, the committee has for once moved too hastily with respect to the release concerning Dr. Edward U. Condon. We appreciate that limited knowledge of the facts makes it difficult for such Members to adequately reply to critics from their districts in the period intervening before the hearing is held. Hence this statement.

First, let me point out that when the Committee on Un-American Activities levels a charge against any individual or organization the reputation of that individual or organization is not alone involved. The reputations of each committee member and of the committee itself hang in the balance, and if our charges are not fully substantiated, we would be discredited as individuals and as a committee, a fate we would richly deserve.

With that frequently accepted risk in mind and with a natural repugnance toward publicizing the shortcomings of any person, but with a deep sense of our obligation to protect our national security, our subcommittee met for consideration of the Condon case.

Dr. Edward U. Condon is Director of the National Bureau of Standards, which acts as custodian of the Nation's basic scientific standards and is one of the most important national-defense research organizations in the United States. It is engaged in projects at the present time concerning atomic energy, radar proximity fuses, instrument-landing systems, jet fuels, and other vital and secret projects that affect the security of our Nation. The Director of this agency has access to the confidential records not only of the atomic bomb but to other information that constitutes the objective of the prying activities of every Soviet espionage agent in the United States.

Dr. Condon was recommended to the vital post he now holds on November 5, 1945, by Henry Wallace, who was then Secretary of Commerce. In submitting his name, Mr. Wallace bypassed the visiting committee of three, who ordinarily pass upon the appointment of the Director of the Bureau of Standards, and when Mr. Wallace was challenged by a member of the committee he stated he did not know it was customary.

Dr. Condon, while with the Manhattan project, wrote a letter to his superior registering his impatience with the security regulations set up to protect the secret of atomic energy.

Dr. Condon is a member of the executive committee of the American-Soviet Science Society which is affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., an organization cited several years ago as a Communist front by the Committee on Un-American Activities and recently also cited as such by the Attorney General of the United States. His name, as a suggester of potential members is used by the organization in recruiting to its ranks scientists employed by the Bureau of Standards—successfully in at least 10 instances.

A member of Dr. Condon's immediate family is a member of an organization cited by the Attorney General as a Communist front and is active in another organization similarly designated by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Dr. Condon has frequently associated with diplomatic representatives of the Russian, Polish, and Czechoslovak Governments. He has been entertained at the homes of diplomatic representatives of the Bulgarian Government. It is a well-known fact that all of these governments are controlled by the communistic leaders of Soviet Russia. Dr. Condon has entertained diplomatic representatives of the Russian, Czechoslovakian and Bulgarian Governments in a home that has been supplied to him by the Government of the United States.

Dr. Condon has been associated with persons known to be subjects of investigation for espionage activity. He has associated with numerous persons who in turn have associated themselves with

known agents of the Soviet Government. He has been associated with an individual who was considered such a security risk that he could not obtain a passport to leave the United States. This person was discharged from the United States Government service because he was considered so pro-Russian that he could not be trusted to guard certain files of the United States Government against Russian encroachment.

Dr. Condon has also been associated with an individual who was dismissed from a non-Government agency because of his Communist tendencies. The identities of all of the persons to whom I have referred will be disclosed at the forthcoming hearing. However, the instances that I have cited should be sufficient to establish the character of the people with whom Dr. Condon has elected to associate himself.

It is conceivable that a person might associate with one or two individuals and have no knowledge of their Communist affiliations. However, when a person having access to vital information relating to atomic energy associates with 30 or more individuals, whether directly or indirectly, who are engaging not only in the dissemination of communistic doctrine, but who are engaged in espionage activity on behalf of the Soviet Russian Government, such association becomes a matter of national concern.

Dr. Condon has made a number of speeches indicating an interest in Russia, one of which was made on the occasion of the Fifth Annual Science Institute on March 5, 1946, in Washington, D. C., from which I quote. Condon, speaking of Russia, said:

> We must welcome their scientists to our laboratories, as they have welcomed us to theirs, and extend the base of scientific cooperation with this great people. Of course, we must behave this way toward the scientists of all nations. I only mention Russia because she is right now the target of attack by those irresponsibles who think she would be a suitable adversary in the next world war.

In the same address Condon made the statement:

> We must regain for all scientists that freedom from military domination if science is to be used for peaceful ends.

Condon's belief in the free exchange of information among world scientists is indicated by the following quotation from his article Is War Research Science? which appeared in the Saturday Review of Literature of January 15, 1945:

> The restoration of freedom to science is one of the elements in the civilization we have been fighting for—freedom from secrecy and freedom from national barriers.

So serious have Dr. Condon's associations been that on May 15, 1947, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sent a confidential letter on the subject to W. Averill Harriman, Secretary of Commerce. Our investigator was able to copy hastily only part of the contents of Mr. Hoover's letter, which was 3½ pages long. That part which we believe to be essentially accurate we quote as follows:

> The files of the Bureau reflect that Dr. Edward U. Condon has been in contact as late as 1947 with an individual alleged by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C., from 1941 to 1944.
>
> Mr. and Mrs. Condon associated with several individuals connected with the Polish Embassy in Washington, D. C. Among those are Mrs. Joseph Winiewicz, wife of the Polish Ambassador, Virginia Woerk, a clerk employee of the Polish Embassy; Helen M. Harris, secretary of the Polish Embassy, and Ignace Zlotowski, former counselor of the Polish Embassy and presently a Polish delegate to the United Nations.
>
> Helen Harris is identified as a former secretary to the American-Soviet Science Society during the time it was known as science committee of the National American-Soviet Friendship Society. She went to work for the Polish Embassy in the fall of 1946.
>
> Zlotowski is identified as a nuclear scientist who studied under Joliet Curie, known member of the Communist Party. He was ex-secretary of the American-Soviet Society. It is known that in February 1947 Zlotowski purchased 270 books on atomic energy which had been published by the Department of Commerce.
>
> It is also known that Mr. and Mrs. Condon were in contact with several other persons closely associated with this alleged Soviet espionage agent. It is also reliably reported that in March 1947 Zlotowski offered the use of the Polish diplomatic pouch to scientific groups as a means of transmitting scientific material outside the United States, dissemination of which had to be restricted because of security reasons by military authorities.
>
> Zlotowski was in contact with Anatole Cromov, first secretary of the Soviet Embassy, who has since returned to Russia. Condon applied for passport June 4, 1946, to Russia, which was issued but was later canceled by the Army.

I do not deem it proper to disclose at this time the full facts upon which the committee acted, since hearings are scheduled for April 21, when the entire compilation will be introduced in evidence. I feel that sufficient material has been presented in this statement to enable you to reach the conclusion to which the committee arrived, namely, that it is the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee that Dr. Condon should either be removed or a statement should be forthcoming from the Secretary of Commerce setting forth the reasons why he has retained Dr. Condon in view of the derogatory information he has had before him.

Since the issuance of our report there has been a hue and cry from certain quarters that our committee was intimidating American scientists and as a result retarding scientific development. When the safety of our Nation is involved, so far as our committee is concerned, no individual or class of individuals enjoy any immunity from exposure, a scientist is accorded the same treatment as the butcher, baker, or candlestick maker.

It is the belief of our committee that Government service is a privilege and not a right, and that an individual who occupies the position of Director of the Bureau of Standards and acts as the custodian of scientific standards and developments, having under his direction projects dealing with secret scientific data vital to our national existence should not hold membership in an organization authoritatively declared to be subversive nor should he cultivate association with card-carrying Communists, and that also holds true of the members of his household.

Because we dared to call attention to Dr. Condon's dangerous associations and affiliations, we have been charged with retarding science.

Was J. Edgar Hoover retarding science when he wrote a three and one-half page letter to the Secretary of Commerce, in which he detailed Dr. Condon's associations?

Was Gen. Leslie Groves, Director of the Manhattan project, retarding science when he had Dr. Condon taken off a Soviet-bound plane in 1945, and refused to permit him to go to Russia, notwithstanding authorization of the trip by the State Department?

We grant that science may have been retarded by the arrest, conviction, and imprisonment for 10 years of Alan Munn May, professor of nuclear physics at Cambridge University, who was found guilty of the charge that he was a Soviet spy. His is not an isolated case—other scientists are serving sentences in Canadian prisons for the same offense.

Let me recapitulate the events that followed release of the report of the subcommittee that occurred at 4 p. m. on March 1. Several hours later, Under Secretary of Commerce William C. Foster, issued a public statement to the effect that Dr. Condon had been unanimously cleared by the Department of Commerce Loyalty Board on February 24, 1948, 6 days before the issuance of the report.

On March 3, the Committee on Un-American Activities served a subpena upon Mr. John L. Towne, secretary of the Loyalty Board of the Department of Commerce, calling upon him to appear before the committee and to bring with him the letter of May 15, 1947, from J. Edgar Hoover, to W. Averell Harriman, together with all records and files pertaining to Dr. Edward U. Condon. Mr. Towne appeared before the Committee and submitted a letter from the Secretary of Commerce Harriman, in which the Secretary said:

> I have after careful consideration reached the conclusion that the release of the documents and information called for in this case would, in fact, be prejudicial to the public interest.

He further stated:

> I have instructed the Secretary of the Loyalty Board of this Department to appear in response to the subpena which you have caused to be served upon him and to report to you that he is not authorized or empowered to produce the papers in question. I have further instructed him, in view of the considerations mentioned above, including the importance of avoiding any action which might prejudice the review of the case by the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission, respectfully to decline to testify concerning the subject matter of the subpena.

The members of the Committee on Un-American Activities feel that it was in the public interest that the entire text of Mr. Hoover's letter be made public. The gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON], a member of our committee, sent telegrams to the Attorney General and to Mr. Harriman, requesting them to make public Mr. Hoover's letter.

They declined to do so. Another member of our committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], called upon President Truman to instruct the Secretary of Commerce to make the letter public. Now I submit, why would they not make the full text of this letter public? It does not contain the names of any informants. No confidences will be violated by its disclosure.

Now let us understand it—this entire letter deals with the activities, the associations, and indiscretions, if you please, of Dr. Edward U. Condon. This letter is a report from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation about the activities and associations of one of the key Government officials. What is there in the letter the President, the Attorney General, and Secretary Harriman desire to keep from the Congress? They have defied a subpena of this House in order to cover up these facts. If they are so convinced of Dr. Condon's fitness and loyalty, and do not consider him a security risk in these perilous times, then why, in fairness to him and in fairness to the Congress and the people, do they not release the content of Mr. Hoover's letter?

Now, I would like to say a few words about this unanimous decision of the Department of Commerce Loyalty Board—the members of which were appointees of Henry Agard Wallace—which was supposed to have been made February 24. After the Secretary of Commerce refused to submit Mr. Hoover's letter, we subpenaed before us the three members of the Department of Commerce Loyalty Board, the Secretary of the Board, the Under Secretary of Commerce, the shorthand reporter of the Board, the investigating officer of the Board and the Solicitor of the Department of Commerce, and while they all informed us that they had been instructed by Mr. Harriman not to give any testimony regarding Dr. Condon, we did determine the following facts, which I think are very important:

First. It developed that Dr. Condon was not unanimously cleared by the Loyalty Board on February 24, as Mr. Foster announced, but he was, in fact, unanimously cleared several hours after the issuance of the subcommittee's report on March 1.

Second. That two members of this Board were not employees of the Department of Commerce when their finding was made, and in order to make it unanimous, one of the former employees was called by telephone in Illinois and permission to place his name on the Board's decision was obtained.

Third. It developed that the Department of Commerce Loyalty Board had been considering the case of Dr. Condon for 10 months; that they reached their decision as a result of the report of May 15, 1947, from J. Edgar Hoover, supplemented by a report of one investigator employed by the Department of Commerce.

Now in this important case, they called one witness during the entire 10 months. That one witness was Dr. Condon. In other words, during this 10 months that Dr. Condon was under investigation, no steps were taken by the Loyalty Board or the officials of the Department of Commerce, to deny him access to top secret material on atomic energy. As a matter of fact, in October of 1947, while the Board was considering Dr. Condon, and after they had received J. Edgar Hoover's letter, they permitted Dr. Condon to attend secret meetings at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and here is what is important about this unanimous opinion of the Loyalty Board. The Chairman of the Loyalty Board, Mr. Adrian S. Fisher, who is now General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, having resigned as Solicitor of the Department of Commerce on February 25, testified before us that his board made a finding purely as to the individual loyalty of Dr. Condon. In other words, they made no finding as to whether through his associations, his affiliations or his indiscretions, he was a security risk, or unfit for the strategic position he held. The very essence of our report concerning Dr. Condon had to do with his associations, affiliations, and indiscretions. We did not charge Dr. Condon with being disloyal. We clearly stated that there was no evidence that Dr. Condon was a Communist, but we did state that Dr. Condon had been associating with individuals who were agents of the Soviet Government. In other words, so far as the Loyalty Board is concerned, Dr. Condon, a person who had access to highly confidential data, can associate every night with Soviet espionage agents, entertain them and be entertained by them, visit their embassies, their homes, entertain them in turn at his Government-owned home at the Bureau of Standards, associate with them socially and he and his family may hold membership in Communist front organizations. They do not take these matters into consideration in reaching their decision. They make their determination purely on whether or not he, as an individual, is loyal to the United States. He might be negligent and irresponsible in his conduct—they do not take that into consideration. They do not take into consideration whether or not he constitutes a security risk. To emphasize this point let me read you what the Chairman of the Commerce Department Loyalty Board said in this connection:

Mr. NIXON. What we want to know is what your Board has decided. As I understand it, then, from my question, your Board has decided only the narrow issue of individual loyalty of the man before you.

Mr. FISHER. That is correct.

Mr. NIXON. In other words, you have not made a decision one way or the other as to whether the man before you—and understand this is theoretical because I do not want you to refuse to answer this—whether or not the man before you may have been guilty of indiscreet associations over a period of time, and might, for that reason, be a questionable security risk for top secret documents.

Mr. FISHER. May I cite a supposititious case which, I think, will clear it up. Let me assume we had a case of a man, I will say.

Mr. NIXON. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. Economic conservative also, if I may state this, a religious man, and a southerner of which there are not economically radical people, I think. Yet, he had the bad habit of getting drunk, telling all he knew whenever he was given a drink. I think that is a supposititious case.

Mr. NIXON. Right.

Mr. FISHER. It is my interpretation under the Executive order that in that case we would have no alternative but to state his failings——

Mr. NIXON. But to clear the man for loyalty.

Mr. FISHER. That is correct. His failings are not before us.

I say that the issue here is not whether Dr. Condon fundamentally is loyal. The question is, can we entrust the very security of our Nation in the hands of an individual who apparently sees nothing wrong in associating with card-holding members of the Communist Party, with associating with persons who are known to be agents of the Soviet Union, and who affiliates with an organization which is in control of Communists? Is he not placing the security and the welfare of the people of the United States in jeopardy through such associations? If Dr. Condon, as a private scientist, wishes to engage in activities in which I know he has been engaged, that is his business, but when he, as a director of the Bureau of Standards, engages in this activity, it becomes not only the concern of the Congress of the United States, but likewise the concern of every citizen of this country. We are playing for keeps now, and misfeasance can be just as disastrous as malfeasance.

In making this statement, I call upon the President to "unfreeze" Mr. Hoover's letter of May 15. Let the Congress and the people see what J. Edgar Hoover reported to Mr. Harriman on May 15, 1947. Let us see what was in the file of Dr. Condon that caused Mr. Fisher, the Chairman of the Loyalty Board, to refer to it as "a hot potato" in his testimony before our committee.

As a result of this case, President Truman has seen fit to ring down an iron curtain between the important information in the files of the executive departments of the Government and the Congress. If we permit his action to go unchallenged, then we are surrendering one of our historic prerogatives, that of the investigative authority of the Congress.

In the Washington Post of Thursday, March 25, 1948, there is an article on page 1, under the byline of Alfred Friendly. I want to read to you a portion of this article:

The subcommittee report on Condon was released on March 1. Two days later, the Washington Post disclosed that when the subcommittee quoted in part from the now famous Hoover letter, it omitted a key sentence. It was not until yesterday, however, that it was discovered that the subcommittee also inserted three sentences which Hoover did not write.

The passage is a supposed summary of passport applications of Dr. and Mrs. Condon for foreign travel. Sources known to be familiar with the text of the Hoover letter assert that the sentences do not appear in that communication.

The Commerce Department has refused a request of the Un-American Activities Committee Subcommittee to make the Hoover letter public.

Here we have a strange situation indeed. We find that the Washington Post is able to refer freely to a document which has been denied to the people's representatives in Congress. The Washington Post is able to say what this document contains and what it does not contain,

yet the Congress is refused by the Department of Commerce and Secretary Harriman the right to learn anything whatsoever concerning it. At precisely what point does the people's rights in this regard end and the privileges of the Washington Post begin? This situation calls for a thorough investigation and removal from office of all responsible and condoning parties, including the Secretary of Commerce, if he fails to take action immediately.

What is there in the file of an official of the Government, or an employee of the Government, that should not be subject to inspection by Members of Congress? To say that we who create these agencies and appropriate the money for their operations do not have an obligation to determine whether or not these agencies are being properly administered or whether the employees of these agencies are loyal or disloyal, or whether or not they constitute a security risk, is absurd. Certainly these are matters of pertinent inquiry to the committees of Congress. The country would never have known about the Teapot Dome or Benny Myers or Gerhart Eisler or Hanns Eisler, if the Congress had not had access to the files of the executive branch of the Government.

The very authority of the Congress has been defied. It is incumbent upon us to override the President's action and the dangerous precedent thereby established.

Your committee has described Dr. Condon as "one of the weakest links in our atomic security." If there are weaker links in our security chain and the same Presidential and departmental safeguards are thrown up to protect them from exposure, the committee can only suggest that the Congress and the people of the United States join together in the fervent prayer, "God help America."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 21, 1948]

WHO SMEARED SCIENCE?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Who smeared science? Who has got people wondering about the loyalty of scientists to the Government of the United States?

On September 5, 1945, a little man walked into the office of the Ottawa (Canada) Journal.

His English was terrible. He had under his arms a large package of papers written in a foreign language. His story was fantastic.

He said that he was a code clerk at the Russian Embassy and that he wanted to report the existence of a Russian spy ring operating out of the Embassy. The papers, he said, were proof of the spy ring's work, documents that he had encoded and decoded.

The Ottawa Journal decided he was a "nut" and threw him out. He tried again the next day. No luck. He tried the Canadian Government. Still no luck. That night, September 6, 1945, he took his baby out of apartment 4, at 511 Somerset Street, Ottawa, to the next-door apartment of Sgt. Harold W. Main, of the Royal Canadian Air Force, and asked Main to look after the child because he, the code clerk, expected to be killed before the night was over.

But Sergeant Main had more sense than the Ottawa Journal or the Government of Canada, both of which had flatly refused to listen to the little man.

Sergeant Main went on a bicycle for the neighborhood cops.

The cops came around to apartment 4, at 511 Somerset Street, shortly after 11 p. m., September 6, 1945, and there found:

Vitali G. Pavlov, second secretary of the Soviet Embassy and chief of the Soviet secret service in Canada, Lt. Pavel Angelov, assistant military attaché, Lieutenant Colonel Rogov, air attaché, and Alexander Farantov, cipher clerk.

They had broken in and were tearing up the apartment. One was under the bed. One was in the clothes closet.

They were after those papers the little man had been trying so desperately to push into the hands of Canada. Thus broke the greatest spy case in North America, and it may yet turn out to be the most important in world history.

For the little man with the papers was Igor Gouzenko, the Embassy's code clerk. The papers were evidence of how the Soviets had stolen samples of uranium with which the United States of America had been making atom bombs. And of how they had stolen military secrets on radar, radio, high explosive, and other scientific weapons of war.

One of the papers the little man had was a coded cablegram to the headquarters of Soviet espionage in Moscow, reading:

"To the DIRECTOR:

"Facts given by Alek: (1) The test of the atom bomb was conducted in New Mexico (with "49," "94-239"). The bomb dropped on Japan was made of uranium 235.

"It is known that the output of uranium 235 amounts to 400 grams daily at the magnetic separation plant at Clinton. The output of "49" is likely two times greater (some graphite units are established, planned for 250 mega watts, i. e., grams, each day). The scientific work in this field is scheduled to be published but without the technical details. The Americans already have a published book on this subject.

"Alex (note: Spelling is from the original—FCW.) handed over to us a platinum with 162 micrograms of uranium 233 in the form of oxide in a thin lamina. We have had no news about the mail.

"Grant."

Decoded and translated, that message said that a Russian spy had furnished Russia with samples of United States atom-bomb material.

The name of the spy was Alan Nunn May.

Dr. May was an Englishman of the upper class, a professor in nuclear physics at ancient and honorable Cambridge university. His family had an ancient and honorable name in Britain. Dr. May was one of Britain's trusted scientific experts on the bomb, frequently in Washington, D. C., during the war.

And he was a Soviet spy. So much so, in fact, that the head of the Soviet spy ring in Ottawa, a Col. Gregory Zabotin, got a direct cable from Moscow to expect May's arrival.

May's spy name was "Alek." Zabotin's spy name was "Grant." And "the director" was the spy headquarters in Moscow.

Dr. May is now doing 10 years in a British prison. He should have been shot for the traitor he was. Numerous other scientists in the very heart of United States-Canadian war work, some Canadians by birth, some British by birth, were all caught in the same net he was.

They are doing time in various Canadian prisons as traitors.

Who smeared science in this case?

One further question: Where did Alan Nunn May get that sample of uranium he slipped to Spymaster Zabotin in Ottawa, Canada?

Uranium for bombs was manufactured only in the United States of America. And May was down here. Who gave him that stuff? There is but one answer possible.

What has science to say for itself? When the first atom bomb drops on America, science can accept the credit, for it was a scientists who gave the uranium to Russia in 1945.

Gentlemen of science, speak up.

[From the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call of Monday, March 8, 1948]

TO RELAX NOW MAY MEAN TO WEEP LATER

Dr. Edward Condon, whose alleged association with Soviet agents is under congressional scrutiny, blithely advises us that he is "entirely reliable" and that "the country can relax." However, there is something in the record against him now before the House Un-American Activities Committee which makes us question the soundness of his advice.

Being Director of the United States National Bureau of Standards, Dr. Condon has access to all our atomic science records and files, and as a scientist has confidential knowledge of the mysteries of the atomic bomb, the one weapon Stalin longs for to speed up the Communist program of Europe's and then the world's subjugation. He of all people should be so beyond suspicion of disloyalty that no voice from any governmental quarter could be raised against him. Not only should he be "not disloyal" as he claims. He should be positively and passionately loyal to the United States, whose Government he is serving in so responsible a position of trust.

But the congressional committee, thank heavens, is not so easily taken off guard, for they have garnered evidence of questionable associations which belie his assurance that "the country can relax." This evidence points to some of his friends and intimates as "alleged Soviet espionage agents." It points to contacts with men and women, who while American citizens are said to be members of the Communist Party, and also to representatives of the Soviet and her satellite nations. It has reference to his membership in a society affiliated with an organization branded by the United States Attorney General himself as subversive.

Certainly these associations of Dr. Condon are not very conducive to inspiring public confidence in his assertion that "the country can relax," while he flits about among those who make no secret of their intent to overthrow our American democracy. Our Congress is right therefore in calling the administration to task for thus letting down its guard at so critical a moment in our Nation's history. It is surely not the time to throw our vigilance out of the window by giving to indiscreet officials in high places, with atomic bombs in their pockets, the benefit of every doubt. With Communist plotters to the east, west, north, and south of us, even cause for the slightest doubt calls for a searching and never-relaxing investigation.

Washington's patriotic advice to be vigilant in the hour of danger won us our liberty. Dr. Condon's unpatriotic advice to relax is the surest way of having it stolen from us.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his very excellent and very factual and very informative statement on this matter. May I also ask the gentleman from Illinois if he has taken cognizance of the many, many accusations to the effect that the committee has attacked scientists all over the Nation, and that scientists have been warned they may be subject to attacks and smears and one thing and another?

Mr. VAIL. I am quite aware of that.

Mr. McDOWELL. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois knows how many scientists have been named in any mat-

ters ever issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. VAIL. I recall of no other scientist.

Mr. McDOWELL. There were two, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, the moon-gazing, left-wing, fellow-traveling gentleman from Harvard University, Dr. Harlow Shapley, and Dr. Condon.

There is one other matter that ought to be cleared up. The accusation has been made by some radio commentators than an irresponsible subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities issued this release. I would like to point out that the subcommittee consists, of course, of the gentleman from Illinois, who is known to the other members of the committee as being one of the most energetic, one of the most able fact-finders, one of the hardest working members of the committee and also one of the most conservative members of the committee. The other two members of the committee consist of the chairman of the full committee who has been a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities ever since it was first established in 1938. The third member of the committee was the minority member, the Honorable JOHN S. WOOD, of Georgia, known to this House for many years for his integrity, his ability, and who most certainly as chairman of the full committee was cautious about those things he did.

Again I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1948—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EATON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 31, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5314. An act to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 2, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1431. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1432. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1433. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 28, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Noyo River and Harbor, Calif., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 586); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1434. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on the Cachuma unit of the Santa Barbara County project, California (H. Doc. No. 587); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1435. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision for a contract authorization of $375,000,000 for the Treasury Department, in the form of an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1949 (H. Doc. No. 588); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1648. An act to authorize the expenditure of income from Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for training of Federal prisoners; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STEVENSON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 347. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 60 days; without amendment (Rept. No. 1654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1235. An act for the relief of Merchants Trapier Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1307. An act for the relief of Edward Trapier Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1312. An act for the relief of Jeanette C. Jones and minor children; without amendment (Rept. No. 1625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 371. A bill for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 564. A bill for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 636. A bill for the relief of Knox Lumber Sales Co., Thomson, Ga.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 838. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford; with amendments (Rept. No. 1629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1303. A bill for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1779. A bill for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation, of Winona, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1801. A bill for the relief of Mose Altman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2131. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Gross; without amendment (Rept. No. 1636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2785. A bill for the relief of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2918. A bill for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association; without amendment (Rept. No. 1635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3114. A bill for the relief of the estate of John Delman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Joe Parry, with amendments (Rept. No. 1638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3261. A bill for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3553. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3644. A bill for the relief of James M. Dingwall, Eileen Reynolds, W. G. Peterson, Bert Woolslayer, and Maisie Purser Davis; with amendments (Rept. No. 1641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3931. A bill for the relief of James W. Keith; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1642). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4518. A bill for the relief of Gerald S. Furman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1643). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4602. A bill for the relief of Forest L. Weatherly; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4718. A bill for the relief of Louis Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 1645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5330. A bill for the relief of W. W. DeLoach; without amendment (Rept. No. 1646). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5387. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury claim board; without amendment (Rept. No. 1647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1263. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3497. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Leinwand; without amendment (Rept. No. 1649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3740. A bill for the relief of Andrew Osiecimski Czapski; without amendment (Rept. No. 1650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4199. A bill for the relief of George Haniotis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4484. A bill for the relief of Theodore Loetsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6085. A bill to amend section 26 of the Shipping Act of 1916; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 6086. A bill to define partnerships and partners for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 6087. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 6088. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase home loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 6089. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, Public Law 134; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 6090. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 6091. A bill to withdraw certain land as available land within the meaning of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 (42 Stat. 108), as amended, and to restore it to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee of Public Lands.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 6092. A bill to authorize the erection of additional facilities at the existing Veterans' Administration facility at Amarillo, Tex.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 6093. A bill to amend section 26 of the Shipping Act of 1916; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 6094. A bill to authorize the United States during an emergency period to undertake its fair share in the resettlement of displaced persons and expellees by permitting their admission into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6095. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. R. 6096. A bill to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa; Kansas City, Mo.; and Omaha, Nebr.; for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 6097. A bill to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 6098. A bill to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 6099. A bill to provide for a national program of old-age retirement, survivors, and permanent disability insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NODAR:

H. R. 6100. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6101. A bill to extend for 3 years the period in which first-class letter mail matter may be transmitted free of postage by members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6102. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Greece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 6103. A bill to repeal the exemption from income tax now existing in favor of certain cooperative associations and corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 518. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on Education and Labor; 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 Commonwealth of Kentucky memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the acquisition and maintenance, as a national shrine, of the Albert Sidney Johnston home, the old courthouse and old post office located in the town of Washington, in Mason County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 6104. A bill for the relief of Thomas Falese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 6105. A bill for the relief of Serapio Zabala-Arrien; 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:

1708. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of sundry citizens for passage of such legislation as may be required for the reduction of shipping rates to stricken foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1709. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition signed by Mrs. William J. Hamilton and 33 other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging the abolition of the tax on yellow margarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1710. Also, petition signed by Mr. C. A. McCall and 33 other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging the abolition of the tax on yellow margarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1711. By Mr. WELCH: California State Senate Resolution 30, memorializing Congress to take such steps as may be necessary to increase the compensation of the postal employees sufficiently to enable them to meet the enormously increased cost of living; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1712. Also, California State Senate Resolution 39, memorializing Congress to adopt the resolution proposed by Representative WELCH asking that the Army, Navy, and Interior Department engineers study the possibility of building a dam at the northern end of San Francisco Bay to separate the salt water of the Pacific from the fresh water of the two rivers; to the Committee on Public Works.

1713. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Selectmen of Holliston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amending the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1714. Also, petition of Henry M. Barnhart, Mount Dora, 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.

1715. Also, petition of Mrs. Maude M. Gibson, Orlo Vista, 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.

1716. Also, petition of Mrs. Ruey E. Collins, St. Cloud, 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.

1717. Also, petition of Leslie D. Sailor and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 2, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, March 29, 1948)

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

Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, let us never be ashamed to come to Thee in prayer, for we are Thy children, Thou art our Father.

Together we pray for the Members of this body who need the healing ministry of the Great Physician and for their