UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Roulhac Gewin, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama. (Mr. Gewin is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 24, 1948.)

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer to be a lieutenant colonel in the Regular Marine Corps:

Robert C. Burns

The following-named officer to be a first lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps:

William E. Bonds

The following-named officers to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps:

Edward R. Carney	Jack L. Reed
Joseph L. Davis	William J. Schreier
Raymond J. Elledge	Donald R. Segner
Robert E. Hill	George F. Thayer
Herbert W. Johnson	Chester E. Tucker
Elmer H. Keshka	Henry M. Walter, Jr.
Chester J. Krist	William J. White
William H. Macklin	Robert C. Whitebread
Robert T. Miller	

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 13 (legislative day of May 10), 1948:

POSTMASTER

Mr. Alvah P. Saulpaugh to be postmaster at Red Hook, in the State of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our ever-living God, to whom we are indebted for all things, grant unto us a clear conception of the best and highest in public and private life. May we earnestly strive to measure up to the principles of the greatest Teacher of men.

Guide our Speaker and the Congress with the spirit of wisdom; help us to be careful of our words as of our actions, and as far from speaking ill as from doing ill. Through these critical times, make us solemnly aware of the challenge that tyranny abroad can be mastered only by a glorious sense of freedom at home, with the whole range of our country as our field of service. In the Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include two addresses.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Sunday Herald of Sunday, May 2.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MALONEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

CEREBRAL PALSY

Mr. MUHLENBERG. 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 [Mr. MUHLENBERG]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of cerebral palsy, and for other purposes. Cerebral palsy, often known as spastic paralysis, is a form of the disease under which there is a tightening of muscles often so severe as to lock the muscles in cramp and prevent normal reaction. It may affect one side only, or one limb, or may affect all extremities. It often affects tongue and throat muscles, causing speech impediment. Mentality, however, remains normal, as is usual in all paralysis cases.

It is due largely to the publicity attendant on the Warm Springs Foundation that this heretofore neglected phase of life of the handicapped has become of general interest because that foundation, while investigating and tremendously helping cases of infantile paralysis, has found it must use all its resources on that work and cannot approach the question of research in or aid to the cerebral palsy handicapped. These thus remain without help. It is a problem truly national in scope and needing national contribution in both money and talent, and it is for this purpose that the bill is presented.

Recently the Washington papers have called attention to the great necessity for treatment of these cases, and it is tied locally to the work of the Crippled Children's Society in Washington, which has done a splendid job under great limitations of equipment and personnel. Also in Washington we have the Goodwill Industries, which has done a fine piece of work in assisting those handicapped by cerebral palsy together with those having other handicaps; but all these local efforts depend so much on the enthusiasm of a single person and can do so little with their limited financial resources that I am convinced that their efforts should be united in work on a national scale, aided by proper equipment and guided by those too few outstanding specialists who have made this study a life work. Almost all the patients can be physically reeducated to a useful position in life, and the relatively small sums which will be used for research would be repaid to the citizens of the United States many times over by the rehabilitation of these presently neglected handicapped persons and by the contribution of their intellectual attainments to the success of our society. I ask your serious consideration and support of the purposes of the bill.

I append hereto a statement about the purpose of the bill made by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the Association of the Physically Handicapped:

STATEMENT OF PAUL A. STRACHAN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, INC.

We have seen for many years the indubitable necessity for special treatment and training of those afflicted by cerebral palsy. Hundreds of cases have come to our attention, and the consensus is that medical science and methods of education have only comparatively recently made headway in this field.

There are three primary phases of importance. Medical treatment, including therapy, education and training of the individual, and education of the general public. Of equal importance is special training for parents of cerebral-palsied children. We have seen all too many instances where the parents, following the false and often dangerous trail of "carrying the child on a pillow," have completely ruined any chance of inculcating in that child the self-determination, reliance, and energy to carry out a program of attainment of physical and professional proficiency.

One great difficulty, also, is public discrimination against employment of cerebral palsied. The average employer evidently feels that a cerebral-palsied person is, as a rule, both incapable and unreliable, and is, therefore, a bad employment risk.

We have made and are making strenuous efforts to overcome this unfavorable condition, but we fully realize that until some universal standard of treatment and training is applied, the cerebral palsied will lack the means needed to benefit and fit themselves for public work.

Therefore, in preparing this bill, we were mindful of the necessity for adequate medical treatment as a prerequisite, and we consulted the most eminent specialists in the field of cerebral palsy to ascertain their views. We believe the bill, therefore, represents a fair composite of opinion of such specialists. We also consulted the organizations of cerebral palsied (spastics) because we know that no one can better understand the difficulties attendant upon this affliction than those who suffer from it themselves.

We know this measure to be necessary to the welfare of hundreds of thousands of our citizens, and we therefore urge early and favorable action by the Congress, as well as all organizations, groups, and individuals at interest, to bring it to speedy and effective operation.

A DRAFT OF ONE IN TEN

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to quote the following editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune on Wednesday, May 12:

A DRAFT OF ONE IN TEN

It isn't easy to know just how many additional men the draft is expected to furnish to the Army, Navy, and Air Service. The other day somebody was talking about 700,000. A few weeks ago the figure was 200,000. A Senate committee on Friday adopted 350,000 as its goal.

The disparity in these figures suggests, first of all, that Mr. Forrestal and his colleagues aren't being candid. Once they get authorization for the draft they can be expected to use it for all it is worth. Their aim is an enormous standing Army, big enough to provide all the good jobs and all the power

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

that an officer class can desire. When the principle of peacetime conscription has been approved, the militarists will produce the crisis or crises that will seem to justify increasing the levies and keeping them high.

Certainly if the need is for no more than a few hundred thousand men, the draft is an absurdity. Conscription can be defended as practical when the Nation wishes to put millions of men in uniform. At such times every sound young man whose services are not urgently required elsewhere is taken. The draft that the militarists are talking about now would take perhaps one young man in ten after all those in his age group who are disqualified for mental and physical deficiencies and all other valid reasons have been eliminated.

Nobody can make that kind of a draft anything but a scandal. With one in ten to be accepted, all kinds of influence would be brought to bear on the draft boards. Favoritism among prospective conscripts was not wholly avoided even in wartime when there was much less opportunity for sharp practice, when most young men were eager to play their part, and when it was relatively easy to obtain men of the highest character to serve on draft boards. In the contemplated draft none of these circumstances would obtain.

The militarists in Washington know this. If they are not alarmed at the prospect, it is because they do not intend this to be a draft of 1 in 10. They are out for a huge conscript army. Some of them have the grandiose notion that with such a force they can boss the world. Certainly with such an army, they won't stay out of any war anywhere in the world; and certainly with such an army, they will destroy the Republic as other republics have been destroyed by military adventurers in other lands.

Actually, there is no need at this time to consider peacetime conscription. The Army Air Force, the Navy, and Marine Corps are having no difficulty in maintaining their complements of enlisted personnel. The Army Ground Forces would have no difficulty either if they would permit voluntary enlistments on the same basis as is contemplated by the proposed selective-service legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SEELY-BROWN and Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

EUROPEAN AID

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1947, Secretary George C. Marshall asked the European nations to tell us how much help they felt they should have from American taxpayers. Since that time there have been many commissions and committees appointed both here and abroad to study and report on the various phases of this program.

The participating European nations met in Paris and on September 22 last year submitted a program to Mr. Marshall. Since that time various arms of the executive branch have put the program through the wringer and have come out with reports and propaganda urging the need for putting the program through not later than April 1. The Congress performed as directed and ERP became law on April third. It, therefore, came as somewhat of a shock to me to read in the New York Herald Tribune of May 6 that the Chairman of our Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable JOHN TABER, had said that he would be unable to make a report on ERP appropriations for another 2 weeks and that the delay was due to the fact that the newly organized ECA was not able to present the facts needed by the committee as rapidly as had been expected. This certainly indicates to me, and I think to any reasonable person, that the program was rushed through without sufficient study.

As this act passed the Congress it authorized the expenditure of $6,098,000,000 in 1 year. This is more money than any Republican administration has ever spent in the same period on the administration of the entire government of the United States. It certainly deserves as much study as the entire budget did back in the days when Congress devoted most of its time to the careful study of appropriation bills.

I am happy to see that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee are demanding the essential facts before giving any further approval. It is heartening to know that this committee is no rubber stamp. Americans should be fully grateful.

We would do well to remember this experience the next time we are asked to rush through legislation without the necessary facts before us.

NORTHPORT IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NEBRASKA

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6067) authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after "Interior", insert "upon finding specifically that existing repayment contracts between the United States and the Northport irrigation district cannot reasonably be carried out by the said district."

Page 1, line 5, strike out "existing" and insert "such."

Page 1, line 6 and 7, strike out "between the United States and the Northport irrigation district."

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Senate added an amendment to the effect "unless it can reasonably be paid back." What is meant by that?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has just heard the amendment read. This amendment reads:

Upon finding specifically that existing repayment contracts between the United States and the Northport irrigation district cannot reasonably be carried by the said district.

It means that where the situation has arisen wherein the time of payment needs to be extended the finding must be made that they cannot meet it within the agreed time.

Mr. RICH. If for any reason at any particular time they are not able to pay it, is that a loophole so that they can forgive all the payments?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, it is not, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. This has to do with a specific Northport irrigation district where the terms are such that they do need some additional time. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is familiar with the subject and interested in it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I might say that under any of the irrigation bills that are passed here the Secreary of the Interior and Bureau of Reclamation are always given a certain amount of authority in adjusting contracts.

In this irrigation district in western Nebraska, four districts are involved, the oldest irrigation districts in the United States. The four districts have had some seepage and needed adjustment in some minor things. The four districts and the Bureau of Reclamation got together and are unanimous on this.

It is merely one of those adjustment contracts and this amendment placed in the bill by the other body bases it on "reasonable prospect of repayment." They must be given some leeway to meet emergencies that come up.

Mr. RICH. It is not then in any way an amendment that foregoes payment or an intent on the part of the people to consider this a loophole through which they can get out of payment?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Not at all.

Mr. RICH. Then I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOULDER CITY, NEV.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4966) directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev., with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "the" and insert "a."

Page 1, line 11, strike "it" and insert "one."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLATHEAD INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5669) to provide for adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 11, line 10, strike out all after "reimbursable" down to and including "Act" in line 13.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if this is the same kind of an amendment as that offered on the previous bill?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I would not say so. This has to do with a different type of operation. This provision stricken out of the House bill, that it is not the intent of this act to settle any claim said tribes may have, and so forth, is a little different.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is looking after repayment of these funds into the Treasury?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF CEREBRAL PALSY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been introduced a resolution by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG] to amend the Public Health Service Act and provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of cerebral palsy, and for other purposes.

Only those who have had in their family anyone afflicted with this dread disease can fully appreciate the import of this resolution. There are many in this country who bear their cross as a result of the travail and the suffering caused their loved ones by cerebral palsy. Little attention in general has been given to those afflicted. Too often the malady is caused by inadequate care at childbirth and by inexpert medical service. Proper research and investigation will undoubtedly tend to prevent in appreciable degree the mistakes and faulty service that bring such misfortune to the people.

It is hoped that the committee in charge of this resolution will be most expeditious in giving it consideration. It will redound to the great benefit of those who are afflicted and also redound to the health and well-being of the country as a whole.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, when the State Department came on Capitol Hill with its so-called economic recovery program, it brought along a document entitled "Commodity Requirements of European Recovery and the Cost of United States Assistance." This document later appeared in a committee print, Outline of European Recovery Program, which I hold in my hand. I read from page 105:

It is extremely difficult to estimate the contribution which the Western Hemisphere countries other than the United States can reasonably be expected to make to the financing of the dollar deficit of the participating countries during the first 15 months of the program. Having regard to all the circumstances it doesn't seem inappropriate to expect that these countries will be able to finance at least $700,000,000 of the participating countries' deficit with them.

The clear implication of this statement was that the success of the program depends upon other Western Hemisphere countries contributing $700,000,000 to the common cause.

When Secretary Marshall and Ambassador Douglas appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Committee members were unable to get any assurance this sum would be furnished by the other countries. Mr. Speaker, since this $700,000,000 is needed for the success of ERP and since it does not seem to be forthcoming it is entirely possible, even probable, that we may be asked to supply it in addition to the amounts already requested.

The Bogota Conference is now over and I have seen no public announcement of any ERP contributions by other American countries. In fact, our Secretary of State told this conference on April 1, 1948, with what authority I do not know, that our "Government is prepared to increase the scale of assistance it has been giving to the economic development of the American Republics." I hope the members of the Appropriations Committee will look into this matter so they can report to us what likelihood there is of other countries joining this cooperative program or if we are later going to be asked to supply another $700,000,000 and then perhaps a few billions more for the "economic development of the American Republics." We certainly should have this information before we vote on further appropriations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Farm Land Prices Continue Uptrend" appearing in the journal of the American Bankers Association.

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Hon. James F. Hoge, of the New York bar. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $301.75, 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.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extracts from the work of Edwin S. Corwin entitled "The President—Office and Powers."

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial, and in the other an article from the State Department.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in Committee of the Whole and include therein an article by James Doherty appearing in the Chicago Tribune.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

UNNECESSARY WASTE OF GRAIN AND GRAIN PRODUCTS

Mr. BUCK. 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. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 1948, I brought to the attention of the membership of the House an annual loss of approximately 600,000,000 loaves of bread resulting from consignment selling by the baking industry. I urged that the practice be curbed by voluntary agreement under Public Law 395.

Efforts to effect such agreement in the industry have failed. Yesterday I introduced legislation to call a halt to this

improvident practice. This shocking waste of wheat and flour, at a time when the American public is being asked to conserve food and peoples abroad are in dire want, is inexcusable. The remedial legislation, applicable to the entire industry, will merely accomplish the result which should have been achieved by voluntary agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I append an editorial from the New York World-Telegram entitled "Why Waste 600,000,000 Loaves?"

WHY WASTE 600,000,000 LOAVES?

In its zeal and zest to promote food saving, particularly the conservation of grain to send to Europe, the Department of Agriculture is printing millions of cookbooks to be supplied free to all American housewives who will merely take the trouble to write their names and addresses on postcards and mail them to Food Conservation, Washington 25, D. C.

These cookbooks, which tell how to make potatoburgers, eggaroni, and like unappetizing, dreary-sounding food-savers, will cost the Government $20,000 per million to print.

Yet, Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson, who is so keen to have American housewives conserve grain for overseas, hasn't even yet stopped the huge annual waste of more than 600,000,000 loaves of bread through the baking industry practice of consignment selling.

This practice means that the wholesale baker, after delivering to retail grocers and restaurants more bread than they can possibly hope to sell, takes back the unsold stale loaves.

Earlier this year Representative ELLSWORTH B. BUCK, of Staten Island, tried hard to interest Congress in this enormous bread waste. Attempts to get from members of the American Bakers Association voluntary agreements to end consignment selling were met by excuses based on competitive difficulties, also professed fear of violation of the antitrust laws.

This, despite assurances from Attorney General Tom Clark that the Department of Justice would take no such action in the case of industrial agreements to further grain conservation.

If saving grain is still so important and imperative, why doesn't the Secretary of Agriculture now take prompt and drastic action to stop, as was done during the war, all consignment selling of bread? It would end the continued shocking waste of 600,000,000 loaves of bread a year, cost the Government far less than its lavish distribution of free cookbooks, and, at least, share the duty to save with the housewife.

"THERE HAVE BEEN DIFFICULTIES TO USE THE MONEY"

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, Government agencies are constantly harassed by the fear that they will have to return unexpended appropriations to the taxpayers. Overseas they catch on quickly. An article appearing in a Danish paper, published in Copenhagen, translated for me by the Library of Congress, says:

Purchase of new scientific apparatuses and instruments is considered as a part of Denmark's reconstruction, and therefore they will come under the $40,000,000 loan which Denmark has got from the International Bank.

Their scientific research board has gathered opinions from all of the technical and scientific laboratories (official), and altogether desires purchases of 2,200,000 crowns.

The Ministry of Education has proposed to the finance committee that this amount will be used, and it will certainly not encounter any difficulties, as it is well known that there have been difficulties to use the money, and the loan has to be used by the end of 1948.

Mr. Speaker, this sort of thing is becoming infectious.

CONGRESSIONAL SUBPENA POWERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the very interesting debate of yesterday on the duty of governmental bureaus to furnish information on public matters to Congress was so affected by the interests of those who, on the one side, would prohibit full disclosure, and, on the other side, those who would expose the transactions and activities of the Pauleys, Condons, and pardoned criminals, and the connection of public officials with those instances that it is hard for the public to know whether the executive department should, under the law, furnish the information. On this point I quote Edwin S. Corwin, the outstanding legal writer, and I quote from page 281 of his great work, The President—Office and Powers, New York University Press:

Nevertheless, should a congressional investigating committee issue a subpena duces tecum to a Cabinet officer ordering him to appear with certain adequately specified documents, and should he fail to do so, I see no reason why he might not be proceeded against for contempt of the house which sponsored the inquiry. And the President's power of pardon, if measured by that on the King of England, does not extend to contempts of the Houses of Congress.

Also on this question, article II, section 3, United States Constitution states the President "shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the State of the Union."

The use of the word "shall" places a duty on the President. Is this to be construed so as to permit the President to evade the duty by giving only such information as is beneficial to him and to refuse to give information that the Congress specifically requests. This particular section of the Constitution has never in practice been given its proper recognition but, in connection with another provision, this language may finally prove to require even the President to respond to subpenas.

CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO IMPEACH OFFICERS

The other constitutional provision I refer to is article I, section 2, which states the House of Representatives "shall have the sole power of impeachment."

That gives the House the power to act as the grand inquest of the Nation. With that power, the Congress is duty bound to see that the actions of all officers of the executive department and particularly the Cabinet officers and the President, conform to the law of the land. How can Congress execute this duty conferred upon it if the executive branch—and particularly the top officers—can refuse to furnish evidence from official Government files that would embarass them and might show they should be impeached?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today certain excerpts from speeches he previously made on the floor in this session.

RACING SHELLS

Mr. REED of New York submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5933) to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells.

H. C. BIERING

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1308) for the relief of H. C. Biering, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "acting" and insert "for his own acount and."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$11,212.05" and insert "$7,057.96."

Page 1, line 9, strike out all after "Biering" over to and including "fact" in line 3, page 2, and insert "and said E. A. M. Biering against the United States for expenses necessarily incurred in contesting the erroneous issuance by the Alien Property Custodian on October 11, 1943, of vesting order numbered 2392, which resulted in the seizure of $67,066.55 from said H. C. Biering, acting as attorney in fact for said E. A. M. Biering, and in securing the return of the sum so seized."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. 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. 6500)

making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make an agreement with the gentleman from Missouri as to time for general debate.

Mr. CANNON. I think we can get along on this side with an hour and a half. I hope we shall not have to consume that much time, but I have requests that would indicate we might need that much time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Would the gentleman cut that down to an hour?

Mr. CANNON. We will make every effort to hold down the debate on this side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Could we agree on 2 hours, an hour on a side?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I think that is running a little close on a major appropriation bill, but I am always glad to agree with the gentleman from Indiana. So we will accept an hour on our side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentlemen from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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. 6500, with Mr. HOEVEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as usual in considering this bill, the committee took no action regarding the items of the Senate, and the bill is written as the budget came to us so far as the Senate items are concerned. With reference to the House, we made very few changes from what the bill was last year. Wherever possible we made reductions. We show a total reduction in the bill of some 8.3 percent. The bill provides the fund which was started in the deficiency bill for additional telephone operators so as to make it possible for each Member to have two telephones which were badly needed and which I do not believe can be called at all extravagant. The fact of the matter is that the officers of the House have been very economical. In many instances the amounts provided for them by law and appropriated for them have not all been expended. They have been turning part of the money back. That applies both to the majority and minority officers of the House. There is one matter that has been called to our attention, and which we have thought a good deal about, although we did not do anything about it in this bill this year. I am inclined to think, however, that we probably should do something next year. As the Members know, the other body provides automobiles for the majority and minority leaders. The House of Representatives has never done that. Here the majority and minority leaders have as much or more use for an automobile in the discharge of their official duties and in accordance with the position that they hold than those of the Senate. As I say, while we did not take any action on it this year, I think it might have been well if we had, and it should be considered seriously next year.

The appropriation for the Capitol buildings has been increased to make some repairs which were needed; $49,000 have been appropriated to paint the dome, and other parts of the building, the architect of the Capitol claiming that they should be painted at least every 4 years and that if that is not done this year they would badly deteriorate and it would cost much more to repair the damage.

There is an increase in the Capitol power plant. One of them is due to the increase in the cost of fuel, in other words, coal. The other increases are because of needed repairs. The power plant, of course, is a big institution, and we have held those repairs to what we consider a minimum consistent with efficiency to permit them to do the work that they are supposed to do to provide the necessary power.

The Copyright Office of the Library of Congress has received an increase. It is not as large an increase as was requested, but I believe it is such as will allow them to get along and give better service this year. By next year we will be able to tell how much money is brought into the Copyright Office as a result of the increase in copyright fees provided in a bill recently passed and signed by the President. At that time we will be able to determine, I believe, the expenditures that the Copyright Office needs in order to perform their functions. Taking it all in all, the bill is not changed a great deal from last year. The Library of Congress asked for numerous increases, the restoration of all cuts made in 1948, and for many additional jobs. The committee did not see fit to grant any of them. What increases are shown are the result of the automatic pay raises under the Ramspect Act and such other legislation. As long as we have those automatic pay raises and provide the same number of employees for the various institutions, there will always have to be an increase in appropriations to take care of those pay raises. In some instances we thought some of those pay raises should be absorbed, and did not allow the full amount.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Was it possible, in reviewing the departments, that you might be able to cut down on some of the employees and thus save some of the funds that were paid to others because of the recent legislation? Did you make any saving in that respect?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I think there is great possibility of that being accomplished if we can get the facts upon which to base our actions in making the cuts. As you probably know, it is the most difficult thing to get any of the agencies that appear before the Appropriations Committee to admit that they have anything that they do not absolutely require. It is a most difficult thing. I think it shows the need of a really true investigation as to the absolute needs.

There is a matter that I shall call attention to in a few minutes, which I think demonstrates the fact very well.

Mr. RICH. When Mr. Woodrum, of Virginia, was a member of the committee, he recommended that each subcommittee have an official representative for that subcommittee, which would cost probably eight or ten thousand dollars a year, but figuring that if they could go to those departments and make an investigation, they could then inform the subcommittee and it would result in a great saving. I have always advocated that on the part of economy, because they could give you the information that you are unable to get.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The subcommittee has its investigators. However, those investigators did not proceed far enough to give us the reports containing anything of value at this time. We hope to have it in good form by next year.

Now, referring to the matter of funds, I think the membership would be very interested in a matter that was called to my attention. During the course of the hearings this matter was gone into. It was called to my attention, and I just wonder if it does not illustrate what the departments do to Congress and to the American taxpayers.

I have a series of pictures here, just a few dozen that came out of what is purported to be 100,000 or 150,000 photographs, taken by the same agency, and now kept in the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress did not take these photographs. That cannot be charged to them, although the Library is preserving them. They were taken by the Federal Farm Security Agency, in the Department of Agriculture.

The first pictures were taken in 1935, and they run through 1943. Some of these pictures were taken while our country was in war and when we were begging the American people to save and buy bonds so that we could have the money to whip the Germans and the Japs; while photographic supplies were in such short demand that the ordinary citizen could not buy them. I know some of my friends, who have small children, wanted to keep a series of pictures of the children each month or each six months, as they grew up, but they could not buy the supplies. They could not get the film and they could not get the paper. But somehow or other, the Federal Farm Security Agency got all they wanted.

All of these pictures were not taken by the Farm Security Agency, however. Some were taken by the Office of War Information. I want to call your attention to them and I want to ask any Member of the House who serves on the Appropriations Committee if it was ever presented to them by the Office of War Information or the Farm Security Administration that they were spending money to take pictures of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

I want you to take a good look at these pictures. Here is the first one taken in Baltimore, Md., in April 1943. This is war-information negative 2208-E. The photographer was Marjorie Collins. The title is "Getting Off a Trolley."

Of what value is it? And that was in 1943. I wonder how much they paid the photographers in traveling over the country? We have pictures here from all sections of the country. How much was their expense? What was their salary? What kind of organizational set-up did they have? Did they have a director and superintendent and staffs and stenographers and such?

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman restate to the committee how many of these photographs were taken in 1943 and 1944?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I cannot tell the number from 1943 and 1944 but the information as I recall is that there are some 150,000 pictures and I understand there are still 137 file cases over here in the Library of Congress filled with these pictures.

Now here is a very good one taken in front of the Security Administration in Washington, D. C., in 1942. The photographer was John Farrell. The title is "Construction of Temporary War Emergency Building on the Mall Near Sixteenth and Seventeenth Street Northwest." That is fine. Now the title of the picture is Pile of Bricks. And that is the only thing shown, a pile of bricks. I want you to take a good look at these.

The next one was taken in Danville, Vt. The photographer was Fritz Henley. The title is "Mr. Hastings in His General Store Taking an Order Over the Telephone." Most illuminating and I know of great value to the country.

But here is one taken at Grand Lake, Nebr., in June 1939, by Dorothea Lang, entitled "The Challenger." It shows a railroad train.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think the gentleman is wrong to criticize these. If the Federal housing shortage continues there will be a lot of people in the near future who would like to look at a pile of bricks; and if inflation continues at the present rate there will be a lot of people who would like to see a man taking an order over the phone in the general store.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Here is one taken in Eufaula, Okla., photographed by Russell Lee. The title is "Oil Cans at the Side of a Filling Station." It shows a large number of empty oil cans piled up.

Here is another taken down in Texas in 1933: "Farmers sitting against the wall."

And here is a wonderful one from Washington, D. C.: "Farm Security Administration." I wonder what this has to do with farms and farm security. The title of this one is "People in Streetcar."

And here is a wonderful one. The title of this is "A Sign." It was taken at Crowley, La., and is a picture of a Coca-Cola sign. The photograph was taken by Russell Lee.

Here is another one, "Man sitting in front of store," taken at Craigsville, Minn.—a wonderful thing.

Here is one taken in Washington, D. C. The title is "A Woman, Probably a Government Clerk, Waiting for Streetcar on a Rainy Day, Probably Near the United States Bureau of Engraving." He did not even know, apparently, where he had taken the picture.

Here is another from Washington: "Three women, probably Government clerks, waiting for a bus on a fall afternoon."

Here is another: "Washington, D. C., August, 1942: Waiting for the streetcar at Seventh and Florida Avenue NW."

Here is one from Plain City, Okla., near Oklahoma City. You people appreciate this one. This was taken by Ben Shahn.

Here is one taken up near Frederick, Md.: "Thresher taking a drink." All you can see is the cup out of which he is drinking.

Here is another fine one: "Baby carriage in front of a lunchroom," taken in South Dakota. You cannot even see the baby.

I do not know why the Farm Security Administration would take one like this: "Detroit vicinity, August 1941: Jack Dwyer taking off his coat in a saloon."

Here is one that shows that the Farm Security Administration photographers were smart and knew what they were doing. This was taken by John Bachon, in Grundy County, Iowa, in 1940: "A corn shock caught on a barbed-wire fence." He does not know what a corn shock is. It might have been a corn husk or a corn shuck, but he probably did not know the difference.

Here is a very interesting one, and I know one that will add a lot. This was taken down in Louisiana in 1941, entitled "Spanish Muskrat Trapper Lying on His Bed After Too Much Whisky and Red Wine."

Here is one of a woman who lives in a row house.

Now, here is a real gem, one that was taken out in Beatrice, Nebr., entitled "Men Picking Their Teeth." This is a Farm Security Administration picture.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. Is it not to the credit of the people of Nebraska that they still have their teeth?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That may be. Here is one in Washington: "The Telephone Used in the Information Division of the United States Department of Agriculture." It is the picture of a telephone, no different from any other telephone.

Here is another one, the picture of a slate roof that was taken by Photographer Mydans at Greenbelt.

Here is one taken at Keysville, Va.: "Girl Showing Boy Her Graduation Ring." It shows two hands, one of them with a ring on it.

Now, we go from the sublime to the ridiculous. Here is one taken in Butte, Mont., by Arthur Rothstein. It is a picture of Venus Alley. If anyone from Butte knows what Venus Alley is they might inform the House. If they do not we will look at the next two pictures.

This one was taken at Butte, Mont., by Arthur Rothstein. It is of Venus Alley entitled, "Sign in a Window in Venus Alley." There is the window with the sign "Elinore" in it.

Here is another one taken at Butte, Mont., by Arthur Rothstein. It is also entitled, "Sign in a Window in Venus Alley," and the sign says "Mickey." There is written and pasted there on the window the following: "I will be here Sunday. Mickey."

Mr. Chairman, there are quite a few more of these pictures if anyone wants to see them. I shall not take time to go through them, but they are all about as ridiculous as the ones to which I have referred.

With reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in regard to cutting down expenses, I wonder if it would not be well to have some real investigations of these departments to find out about these things. I venture the assertion that no one on the committee had justified to them the expenditure of money for purposes such as demonstrated by these pictures. The pictures have file numbers; they are all cataloged; they are all numbered, the numbers of the films are given, and they are mounted on photographer's cardboard. That went on from 1935 through 1943. So I say, Mr. Chairman, it is high time that the Appropriations Committee and the membership of the House in general scrutinize these appropriations and scrutinize them closely to see that things of this character are not carried on any longer. This sort of thing should be stopped immediately.

I recommend most highly all of the investigations possible so that we may have all the information we can get before we appropriate money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], on the very thorough and comprehensive hearings he held on this bill, and the economy exercised in drafting the bill. I do not think we have had within my recollection a more able or efficient chairman in charge of this bill than the gentleman from Indiana. He is a businessman, and he has handled this bill, which is a business proposition, in that it is the housekeeping bill of the Congress, in a practical businesslike way. It has been a pleasure and privilege to be associated with him on the committee.

We have reported out a fairly good bill. I do not approve of all the provisions in the bill, especially the provisions for the Congressional Library. I think there should have been some amendments, which I will take occasion to call up later. For the present, in order to

have ample time, I shall discuss a collateral matter.

Mr. Chairman, on May 6, 1948, in the debate on the conference report on the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1948, I said, as reported on page 5454 of the RECORD:

> It is to be regretted that when the original appropriation was made a sufficient amount was not authorized to have taken care of the situation without having to incorporate it in this bill.

In response to that statement the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] said:

> I take this time merely to keep the record straight in view of the statement that has just been made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who has the facility for making statements that sometimes do not accord with the facts.

Let us consider both the gentleman's statement and the facts. The first question is, What is there in the statement that does not accord with the facts? No one will deny that it is a matter of regret that sufficient funds were not originally provided, thereby avoiding this long drawn-out procedure here in the House and in the Senate, as well as the readjustment required in the various States threatening the dismissal of hundreds of essential employees and the closing of public employment offices. Does anyone contend that it is not a matter of regret, and is there anything in that statement warranting the vicious language used by the gentleman from Wisconsin?

But the gentleman from Wisconsin goes on to say:

> The gentleman from Missouri has sought to give the impression it is unfortunate we are compelled to consider this deficiency because the matter should have been taken care of in the regular appropriation estimate or when the regular appropriations and estimates were considered for the fiscal year 1948.

So let us take the gentleman's point of view. It is nothing new for this session of Congress, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has well said, to be compelled to consider deficiencies because the matter which should have been taken care of in the regular appropriation bill was deferred under the guise of a saving or an economy and had to be taken care of in a subsequent deficiency bill.

You cannot recall a deficiency bill which has been considered in this Congress in which there were not large items replacing money which had been cut from the estimates and heralded to the country as an economy. I called attention to a number of such instances when the first deficiency bill was under consideration. And items aggregating $1,068,000,000 for tax refunds to replace the $800,000,000, broadcast all over the Nation as a saving in the last session, were carried in House Joint Resolution 355, and in the first deficiency bill passed in the first week. They cut out of the estimates $800,000,000 for tax refunds and included them in a tabulation they presented to the country as a retrenchment, claiming they had saved $800,000,000 for the Public Treasury. It now develops that they not only failed to save $800,000,000, but they had to put back the $800,000,000 and $268,000,000 besides.

But the gentleman says these deficiencies to which we refer have risen because of situations which could not have been in the contemplation of the committee at the time the budget estimate was considered, due to wage increases given State employees long after they considered the 1948 budget; that such items are imponderables.

Let us look at it from that point of view.

The Senate proposed an additional appropriation of $1,850,000,000 for grants to States for unemployment compensation administration. That was the proposition before us. $57,586,000 had previously been appropriated for this purpose in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1948. Later that amount was further increased by $8,026,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1948. These two appropriations combined fell short of the budget estimates by $4,000,000, and it was represented to the country that the $4,000,000 was a saving.

Also, the Senate proposed an appropriation of $2,560,000 for grants to States for public employment offices—$57,382,400 was appropriated for this purpose in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1948, and that amount was later increased by $7,460,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1948. Again, the two appropriations combined fell short of budget estimates by $8,345,600.

In both instances it will be noted that the additional amounts proposed by the Senate to the pending bill, the first deficiency bill, 1948, were well within the amounts by which the budget estimates presented to the last session were reduced. In other words, had the knife been used more judiciously, there would be no need now to consider a third request for funds for the current fiscal year.

As a matter of fact, the sums carried for unemployment compensation and employment offices in the first deficiency bill will not be sufficient to keep those services functioning effectively. A fourth estimate may be expected before the close of the session. And I predict now that in addition to the amount which we carried in this bill, there will be a fourth and further request for additional appropriations because even on this third bite at the cherry we did not give them enough money to see the unemployment compensation administrator and the employment offices through.

So far as the estimates not being contemplated that may be; but, on the other hand, had the prior appropriations contained a reasonable margin for contingencies as most lump-sum appropriations do, there would be no need now for the Congress to be devoting its time to this third request

Mr. Chairman, appropriating on the installment plan is neither economic nor efficient. And it is a deceptive course, because the amounts which the people are led to believe have been saved ultimately must be restored in large numbers in supplemental grants.

The gentleman from Wisconsin concludes by saying that as a result of the hearings conducted this morning we are providing the deficiency funds as a result of situations that have arisen since the regular 1948 appropriations and estimates were considered. Even granting the gentleman's contention, no such situation, Mr. Chairman, has arisen since the Senate held hearings on these items and sent them to the House. In the conference with the Senate conferees the gentleman from Wisconsin—and he was particularly and specially mentioned in the Senate as the leader of these obstructive tactics—the gentleman from Wisconsin had before him all the information the Senate had when it provided for these deficiencies. And if there was any further information which he needed or wanted, he could have held brief hearings at that time, as he later did in order to save his face after it became evident that the situation was so intolerable that he would have to yield.

The explanation was that the gentleman from Wisconsin was against allowing money to maintain the Unemployment Compensation Service in a going condition. He was against allowing money to keep the Employment Office open.

He was against it when the Senate amendments were considered in the preliminary meeting of the House conferees. He was against it when he considered the Senate hearings. He was against it when the Senate conferees argued with him that the two services must be continued and could not be continued without the money provided in the Senate amendments. He was against it in the second conference until it became clear that the country would not be denied these essential appropriations.

The gentleman from Wisconsin says the situation could not have been in contemplation of the committee and that the items were imponderable, but in both the first and second conferences with the Senate and with the hearings and report and amendments before the conference available, he knew exactly or could have known what was required and why.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

In both the first and second conferences with the Senate, with the Senate hearings and report and amendments before the conference, he knew exactly, or he could have known exactly what was required and why it was required. There were no imponderables then. But he was determined to deny these social-security agencies the bare appropriations required to keep them alive and functioning, and he continued that opposition as long as it was tenable.

There is nothing new in the gentleman's obstinate opposition to adequate funds for these two social-security services. We have but to go back to the genesis of social-service legislation to understand the gentleman's attitude.

Under the terrible depressions which scourged the country prior to 1933, regardless of how industriously men

labored—or how well they managed—there were many who were able to lay aside a competence for retirement. There was no place for indigent old age but the poorhouse, and periodically industries shut down and turned millions of men out on the streets who tramped the highways and "rode the rails" looking for work, any kind of work, at any wage, to support their families. But there was no recourse except ineffective public charity or crime.

And nothing was done about it. President Hoover was appealed to but neither he nor his Congress exhibited any interest while the situation grew steadily worse.

It was left for President Roosevelt and his Congresses to enact the Social Security Act which, for the first time, provided old-age assistance for the superannuated, unemployment compensation for those unable to find jobs and aid for dependent children and for the blind and unfortunate.

When the bill was finally reported to the House, the entire Republican membership on the Ways and Means Committee unanimously joined in filing a minority report bitterly opposing it, insisting it was unconstitutional, and predicting it would increase unemployment, and they continued to oppose expanded activities and increased appropriations as vigorously and as uncompromisingly as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] opposed them in the conferences on the deficiency bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will permit me to complete my statement, I shall be glad to yield.

The position which the gentleman takes here in opposing proper funds to continue these activities is the traditional position taken by his party from time immemorial. But the forces of public opinion and the extraordinary success of the social-security service, especially the unemployment compensation and public employment service features, forced them to modify their position, and at the last Republican National Convention at Chicago a platform was adopted pledging this Congress to an expansion of the social-security activities.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has been a particularly prejudiced obstacle to the redemption of those solemn party pledges. So notorious has been the attitude of the gentleman from Wisconsin in that respect, not only the 1948 program but on the 1949 program as well, that it has been protested in the public press. For example, the Washington Post in its issue of May 5 says editorially:

> The House of Representatives last week passed an appropriation bill for the Federal Security Agency—

And that bill was passed under the direction of the gentleman from Wisconsin, who was chairman of the subcommittee which drafted it. This editorial refers directly to his personal handiwork.

> The House of Representatives last week passed an appropriation bill for the Federal Security Agency, in which the funds requested by the Bureau of the Budget for operation of the Social Security Administration were cut so drastically as to invite its disintegration.

That is a strong statement, but the Washington Post, one of the great newspapers of the Nation and the world, considers itself justified in making that emphatic statement.

> These are strange ways indeed to carry out the 1944 Republican Party platform pledge to support "extension of the existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems to all employees not already covered."
>
> The Budget estimate for operation of the office of the Social Security Commissioner was $3,151,165. The amount appropriated by the House was $221,000, a cut of no less than 93 percent. The effect, of course, is to leave the Commission impotent. His office is the nerve center of a complex system in which competing demands for protection of children, the aged, the blind, and the unemployed must be brought into balance. The regional offices through which his controlling influence was exerted are taken away from him and the determination of policy is thrown back, in effect, to the level of the four constituent Social Security Bureaus. These, then, instead of being integrated are all too likely to be working in rivalry and at cross purposes.
>
> The budget request for informational services was reduced from $109,997—certainly no great sum for a Federal organization serving millions of American citizens—to $79,997. This will mean that people who have rights under the social-security program, rights gained through their own contributions, may all too frequently lose them through ignorance. Widows or orphans entitled to insurance benefits may find them forfeited solely because of an information failure. Equally short-sighted is the slash of $100,000 from the $230,000 asked for research and statistics. This will cut the research staff of this great Agency from 50 to 20 persons, clerical and administrative personnel included, and will hamper intelligent planning for the future.
>
> Most damaging of all, perhaps, is the cut of nearly $23,000,000 in the funds for the United States Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Commission and the combination of the two in a new Bureau of Employment Security entirely outside the jurisdiction of the Social Security Administration.

It is to be noted that, although we passed the streamlining bill in the last Congress by a tremendous majority, guaranteed for all time to come to eliminate riders on appropriation bills, eliminating a practice that everybody agreed was reprehensible, legislation under the guise of an appropriation; that the gentleman resorts to that unlawful and unparliamentary practice in his efforts to cripple social-security legislation and deny social-security funds.

> This is obviously outright legislation in the guise of an appropriation bill. It tends to segment and disrupt what should be coordinate and complementary. The Social Security Act is too vital and valuable a part of the Nation's economic structure to be subject to this sort of trickery and demolition. The Senate, it is to be hoped, will show a greater measure of true conservatism when it considers this appropriation bill.

Let us hope the Senate justifies that expectation, and that the Senate conferees will this time be more successful in resisting the objections of the gentleman from Wisconsin than they were in their first conference with the gentleman on the first deficiency bill.

The Washington Post says the work of the gentleman from Wisconsin and his colleagues, in their attempts to sabotage the social-security services, amounts to "demolition." Is it to be wondered that he seeks to divert attention from that record by abuse and vituperation?

Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the numerous and diverse subjects necessarily under debate in the House it is inevitable that there should be differences of opinion. And we have honest differences of opinion every day here on the floor, But such differences do not warrant the personal abuse and the vile and unparliamentary language used by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

By way of contrast it is only necessary to note how differences of opinion have been customarily handled in this session. When our distinguished and beloved Speaker made the statement in a radio address which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that a Republican Congress had balanced the budget for the first time in 16 years, I disagreed with him briefly, as will be noted on page 1634 of the RECORD:

> Reverting to articles in various national magazines just referred to, there appeared in a recent issue of Collier's a high and deserved encomium on the Speaker of the House. I subscribe most heartily to the many laudatory things said in that article about our distinguished Speaker. I yield to no one in my affectionate regard for him as a man, or in my regard and admiration for his outstanding ability as a legislator, as the Presiding Officer of the House and as heir-apparent to the Presidency of the United States. No more talented and gifted man has served in the high office of the Speakership. But there is one perhaps inadvertent statement in the article—one which has since been repeated in many quarters—which must not be allowed to go unchallenged.
>
> The statement was to the effect that under his Speakership a Republican Congress has balanced the budget; that the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress achieved a balanced budget for the first time in 16 years; that it took a Republican Congress to achieve the first balanced budget in 16 years.
>
> Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no foundation whatever for such statements. When the Republican Party took over control of the Congress in January 1947, the budget they received from the President was not only in balance but it was in balance for the first time since it went into the red during the Hoover administration. If anyone here on the floor, or elsewhere, entertains the slightest doubt about the accuracy of that statement, or if there is any claim that our Republican friends are entitled to any credit for balancing the budget for either the fiscal year of 1948 or 1949, it is only necessary to examine the figures set forth in table 5, on page A-10 of the Budget, submitted to the Congress early last month.
>
> The last fiscal year in which we were at war was the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. Only 6 months and 3 days following the close of that fiscal year the President presented a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1948. And that is the year Republican apologists would have the country believe they balanced the budget. Such claims are manifestly absurd. You can be certain the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who probably knows as much about the fiscal affairs of the Nation as any man alive, has never made any such ridiculous claims as that.

The Government was in the red when they turned it over to us in 1933. We received it in the red and we turned it back to them in the black. And in my opinion, it will be in the red again when they return it to us in the next Congress.

When—page 3972—the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], said, in the course of his remarks on the first deficiency appropriation bill, that only six or seven million dollars were for replacement of cuts made in former bills, my comment was:

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.

However, when the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who seems to have a predisposition for such statements, charged on the floor on March 11 that facts had been garbled, I answered him, page 2586, in kind:

Even if the President wanted to keep these Communists in the bosom of the Government, which is unthinkable, the weight of public opinion would force them out. We have seen aroused public opinion operate. We saw the effect of pitiless publicity on the three fellows we had up here in the last Congress. When payment of their salaries was refused they applied to the Court of Claims, and the Court of Claims sustained them. We carried it up to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court said they were entitled to draw their back pay.

But their position was untenable. All three of them resigned. The department was too hot to hold them. Public opinion was too intense to permit them to stay. We got rid of them. If we handled those 3 we can handle these 14 just as effectively and just as expeditiously under this resolution.

The other day when this matter was up, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] took issue with me and made the statement that the facts were being garbled, that the facts were not given, or that the facts were misrepresented. I have notified the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that I would take this up today. May I say that if there is any misstatement of fact, and apparently there was, it was the gentleman from Wisconsin who was guilty of the misstatement of facts on this floor. Here is what he said:

"He"—the gentleman from Wisconsin—"should get himself in accord with the facts and not make the charge on the floor of the House that the Republican chairman and the Republican Committee on Appropriations are failing in their responsibilities to get rid of communism existing in the State Department."

Well, now, what other conclusion can there be? The chairman of the committee made the statement on the floor that the Communists were there, and he has done nothing to get rid of them. At least, no action has been recommended or reported to this House providing any kind of a method for their disposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin then said:

'The gentleman from Missouri makes the bald statement that under his administration as chairman he got rid of three of them and challenges the present chairman to emulate him in doing the things which he says never took place at all. * * * They did not fire these people at all. They stayed on the job."

Anybody knows that a Communist never gives up a job on the inside as long as he can hold it. These people would be in their jobs today if we had not taken action. We did get rid of them. They are no longer a part of the Government. All of them were out of the employ of the Government before the opinion was handed down by the Supreme Court.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin takes great credit to himself for the part that he had in this proceeding.

He makes the statement that he had the honor to suggest on the floor of the House that a new special committee should be appointed for this purpose. And he says it was done. You get the impression in reading his speech that he initiated the proceedings. As a matter of fact, all he ever did was to go along with the Democratic majority. The matter was first suggested by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], who, in 1942, proposed that action be taken, and who, in 1943, offered an amendment to deny the salary of certain men accused of being Communists. At the time that amendment was under consideration, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] debated the question. He made no suggestion whatever that he had ever thought of taking any such action. He was undoubtedly present, because he is quoted in the RECORD as saying:

"The very voices that are now crying out against the adoption of this amendment, however, are the voices that in the last campaign vilified me because of my pre-Pearl Harbor votes."

He seems to be sensitive about his pre-Pearl Harbor votes.

And Mr. O'Connor interrupted him to say:

"I was branded just the same as was the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] by the New Republic as being an agent of the Nazi government."

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] acquiesced:

"I remember well the situation that existed in this country at the time of the last war. I know how emotions can be whipped up, and I feel that we should act deliberately in this matter with full knowledge of what we are doing."

Then he makes a statement that he was appointed on the committee by the Speaker of the House. He had just previously said he was glad I had appointed him. So, it is a question of when the gentleman was making a misstatement. Was he making a misstatement when he said he was appointed by the chairman of the committee or when he said he was appointed by the Speaker? Certainly, he was making a misstatement when he said we did not get rid of the three Communists.

The gentleman from Wisconsin not only contradicted himself but he also contradicted the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] when he insisted that due to the decision of the Supreme Court the committees of the House were without power to rid the department of Communists and other objectionable employees. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] in the same colloquy stated that his committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, was getting rid of many of them. If the method by which the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is getting rid of the Communists in the departments is not permissible under this resolution, then let us adopt the plan followed so effectively by Mr. JUDD's committee. Let us use it on the 14 Communists which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations tells us are impregnably intrenched in the State Department. Let us either take steps to get rid of Communist-affiliated employees in the Government or quit talking about them.

Mr. Chairman, all such differences of opinion have been disposed of in a parliamentary manner but in this instance when a statement is made that there is cause for regret that an original appropriation was not provided to avoid a deficiency, then partisan members vote to leave in the record a churlish and unwarranted statement, a violation of the rules of this House or of the rules of any other self-respecting parliamentary body, that the gentleman from Missouri has a facility for making statements that do not accord with the facts.

I am glad to say, Mr. Chairman, that it was not the action of the House. It was the action solely of members on that side of the aisle—and many on that side of the aisle did not concur in it.

And I was about to overlook the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. At the close of the vote, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] secured 1 minute to make a charge of something manifestly worse which had taken place in 1945. I had to look it up in the RECORD to find what it was. And I wish anyone interested would take the time to read the debate on the subject on December 11, 1945. I was trying to save $17,000 on a new office which had been created the year before and which everybody who appeared before the committee said had accomplished nothing. I wanted to abolish the office and save the $17,000 and

the House did abolish it and it has never been referred to since. But the gentleman from Ohio evidently favored spending the money and interrupted to ask a question and then proceeded to make a stump speech, which I deleted from my remarks, under the rules of the House. I had forgotten saving that $17,000, but evidently he has not forgotten it.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the vote of confidence received—on both sides of the aisle—for I count the adverse vote on that side of the aisle especially significant. It is a high compliment that in the debate here on the floor the gentleman from Wisconsin, unable to discuss the merits of his case convincingly, found himself at such a loss as to have to adopt the course traditionally followed by the shyster lawyer who, having a poor case, resorts to abuse of the opposing attorney.

But, may I remind certain gentlemen on that side of the aisle that name calling is not argument and abuse is not statesmanship.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, of course the rules of the House do not permit me to speak the sentiments that are rushing and crowding for expression at this time. What words I was able to hear as uttered by the gentleman from Missouri—and I sat within 6 feet of him in the front row while he was delivering himself of this abusive declaration toward me—those things which I was able to hear indicated to me the truth of the old adage, "He who tooteth his own horn is like he who dyeth his mustache; he kiddeth only himself."

The gentleman, apparently cringing under what he conceives to be an unwarranted lash administered by the House of Representatives the other day, when by a roll call vote of 171 to 137 the House refused to expunge from the May 6 RECORD the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin, has apparently taken a lot of time to build up a defense against that action that he wants to use down in his district in the forthcoming campaign. He has delivered himself of a speech for home consumption. He has gone far afield from the issue that was before the House on the 6th of May, and the gentleman well knows it. He has digressed in his remarks in a manner that ill becomes one who is frequently referred to as a great parliamentary leader.

I shall in due time take a little time and make a speech that will gather together some of the votes and remarks of the gentleman from Missouri that reflect his attitude.

Mr. Chairman, I was in my office this morning from 8:30 to 11:45 a. m. At no time did the gentleman advise me that he intended to attack me. Common courtesy would have required this. I ask for none from the gentleman, however, and assure him that in due time I shall answer every statement in his speech. He has asked for it and the House is entitled to the facts in order that the record may be kept straight.

Oh, how he loves to appear as the bleeding heart, bleeding for underprivileged humanity, and the great defender of social security. Without any research I well remember the time when the gentleman who is now addressing you offered an amendment to a deficiency bill then pending that provided the initial funds and program for setting in motion the emergency material and infant-care program. Who was it that arose on the floor of the House and objected? The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. But that effort in behalf of the wives and children of servicemen would not be denied, despite the opposition that he made, and when the bill came back from the Senate the provision was in that bill and there was not a dissenting voice.

The gentleman from Wisconsin, whom he has attempted to depict as the enemy of social security, as he well knows and as the record will show, and I will put the exact quotations in the RECORD and the reference to it when I revise these remarks and get permission to do so in the House, will indicate the attitude that the gentleman from Missouri then expressed with respect to one of the greatest programs that was developed during the war.

Now let us get to the basic facts that prompted me to make the statement which I did in this RECORD of May 6.

We were in conference with the Senate on the deficiency bill. The Senate committee placed in the deficiency bill two items, one for administration expenses for unemployment compensation administration in the States, and the other for administrative expenses for the State employment services. One was $2,500,000 and the other was somewhat in excess of that amount broken up as two separate items.

Those matters had never been considered by a committee of the House of Representatives. They were put in by the Senate. When we went to the conference, I looked through the Senate hearings and found that they were very skimpy indeed, to say the least. There was no break-down whatsoever to show what those funds were to be used for. I objected to giving these millions of dollars additional to these two services until I knew what the money was for. The Senators agreed and we had a unanimous agreement, and my little friend from Missouri was there and did not object. He signed the conference report. The conference report came back to the House and was passed unanimously, and the gentleman from Missouri never objected then as he had a right to do. Then the conference report went to the other body. In the meantime, the States of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, California, and Michigan indicated that due to situations that had arisen in those States, the operation of those services might be impaired if that deficiency was not allowed. So the Senate sent it back to the conference for further consideration. Again we went to the conference called by the Senate and after hearing the facts, the chairman of the conference, Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, requested me as chairman of the House committee to hold a hearing the next day and get a break-down of those two estimates so that the conference would know what it was all about. Did the gentleman from Missouri object then? He did not. He sat there without opening his mouth, largely because, I assume, he did not know or understand what was before the conference. I conducted those hearings the next day, starting at 9:30 and concluding at 11:30. As a result of this conference and that hearing, we received a break-down from both the UC and the Employment Service operation showing what those moneys were to be spent for. The gentleman from Missouri apparently does not understand it at all. But as a result of that effort, the conference struck from this deficiency appropriation $1,325,185 in one item and, I believe, approximately $250,000 in another. Of course, the saving of a million and seven or eight hundred thousand dollars perhaps does not mean anything to the gentleman from Missouri, but it meant something to this conference of which he was a member. Again the conference agreed on striking out that amount of money from this deficiency as a result of the hearings conducted by the gentleman from Wisconsin, whom the gentleman from Missouri condemns so bitterly this morning. Again the gentleman from Missouri signed the conference report. Again the report came back to the House and was passed unanimously. Today the gentleman from Missouri stands on the floor and denounces the gentleman from Wisconsin as being an enemy of social security. Let me tell you something. You may get away with that down in your district in Missouri—where you have some pretty tough opposition this fall, I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. I will take my chances with the membership of this House or with the people of this country who have written me reams of letters, which I can show, indicating the magnificent work that the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman has done in this field. You will see before we get through that we have done one of the most constructive jobs in the interest of social security in this country that has ever been attempted. Were I to follow the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] I would take these budget estimates as they are handed up here, hold a little mimic hearing and report it to the Congress and beat my breast saying what a great job I had done.

Where was the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] when the report came from Congress and the bill, of which he complains, was reported? Was he on the floor? Did you hear a squeak out of him? You did not. He was a member of the Appropriations Committee, and this House, with only about 29 votes against it on the roll-call vote, supported the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman. Most of the debate on the bill related to the so-called non-Communist rider. Where was the gentleman from Missouri at that time when his voice might have been heard? He was silent. Then he comes in here

today, when he apparently has charge of the time on this bill, and attempts to excoriate the gentleman from Wisconsin as being opposed to social security.

The gentleman from Missouri made the statement when the deficiency bill came back here:

> It is to be regretted that when the additional appropriation was made a sufficient amount was not authorized to have taken care of the situation without having to incorporate it in this bill. Certainly the House should have agreed to the Senate amendment without requiring this extra conference.

It was the unanimous action of the conference that resulted in the extra hearing, and the gentleman from Missouri was there. Why did he not raise his voice then? He did not, because the action of the conferees was unanimous and it was right.

Now, let me tell you the facts. The facts are simply these, that subsequent to the regular appropriation estimates being approved for 1948, due to a natural-gas shortage in Michigan, and due to circumstances that could not be foreseen, there was a tremendous amount of unemployment that was not figured in the estimates when they were made for the fiscal year 1948. There were wage increases in all State services that could not be anticipated. Those wage increases made the administration cost more money. So they came in and asked for a deficiency. We supposed it was because of that critical situation. But when we broke the situation down we found that on the employment office side $1,325,000 of that requested deficiency was for what purpose? A purpose unknown to anybody heretofore. They requested it in order that six States might dip into this title III money, and fortify their State systems of retirement and use the money that was paid under title III to fortify the retirement systems of those six States, by taking out of that fund the money necessary to make the employer's contribution to the State retirement fund; something unheard of; never presented to any committee of Congress.

When we developed those matters before the conference every member of the conference, Democrats and Republicans alike, said, "It is an unheard-of thing. We want to know what the facts are."

In fact, I furnished the distinguished Senator from New Mexico a copy of an opinion by the Comptroller General, and after reading it he was of the opinion that there was a serious question as to the legal authority for us to make expenditures of that kind. And my little friend from Missouri sat there with his mouth closed; never opened his mouth during the entire conference. Again, I repeat, he did not open his mouth, because he does not understand and does not know the techniques that are involved in the administration of the employment services or the administration of the unemployment compensation.

Then he has the effrontery to stand up here in the well of the House and condemn and damn me. I have spent 10 years of my life in diligent study and effort to promote the administration of the employment services and unemployment compensation throughout this country, and every State administrator well knows that to be a fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. I have no present knowledge as to what the gentleman has included in his speech. I assure you that as soon as I have had an opportunity to read the statement of the gentleman from Missouri, I shall answer it in order that the record may reflect the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] has 25 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], 25.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who has just spoken, has not even attempted to touch the real issue. He has very carefully avoided it. He has not attempted to justify the unpardonable language which he used on the floor.

He has confined his discussion entirely to the complaint that the members of the minority did not save him and his colleagues from their error in opposing adequate appropriations from the Unemployment Compensation Administration and the unemployment offices.

Nor can he take refuge in the fact that even after the bill and first conference report came to the floor a dictatorial minority did not deter a downtrodden majority from passing the bill and the conference report dictated by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

He makes a frank confession. He concedes that he knew all about the bill and that no one else knew anything about it. That is all the greater condemnation of his determined opposition to a minimum appropriation to keep social-securities activities functioning.

The criticism of members of the minority for signing the conference report and voting for the bill or the report are absurd. They had no voice in the matter. You cannot oppose or refuse to approve and vote for a bill or a conference report carrying vital appropriations simply because you do not approve of one or two items in the bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that the conference report was unanimous? And that the gentleman from Missouri was present there all the time and agreed completely with everything that was said and done?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly not. No member of the minority agreed to the drastic cut the gentleman insisted on making in the social-security funds. But we had to sign the report or be placed in the position of opposing essential appropriations for other purposes carried by the bill and refusing funds the lack of which would have placed other activities in as precarious a situation as the Unemployment Compensation Administration and the employment offices.

Mr. KEEFE. But the gentleman voiced no opposition in the conference.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman knows I did not agree. I signed the conference report, because I had no choice.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course the gentleman did.

Mr. CANNON. It was a case of signing it or abandoning the rest of the bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAVIN. I wish to ask the chairman what legislation we are discussing. What good bill is before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole in general debate on the bill H. R. 6500. The gentleman from Missouri has been recognized for 5 minutes and his time has not expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the bill under consideration. It is time we got back to a discussion of this bill. We have taken too much time on extraneous matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that under general debate, the debate is not confined to the bill.

The point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. CANNON. I can understand the anxiety of the gentleman to get away from the facts in the case, and I can understand the anxiety of the gentleman from Wisconsin to get away from the facts.

He says he was not aware of the situation necessitating the appropriation of these funds until the morning of the last conference. As a matter of fact, he cannot deny that he knew of the facts on which the Senate had based its amendments and he knew of them before the first conference. He cannot dodge that. The Senate hearings and report were simultaneously available with the Senate amendments. He cannot disguise the fact that he was opposed to the efficient administration of the social-security law as evidenced by his refusal to agree with the Senate conferees after long and exhaustive argument with them in the first conference. He was just traditionally opposed to the whole idea. He knew at that time that failure to make the appropriation would require the discharge in the State of New York alone of over 900 employees and make it impossible adequately to administer the program. He knew at that time that in the State of Michigan, for example, they would have to close numbers of employment offices immediately, making it impossible to attempt adequately to administer the program. And still he refused even to compromise with the Senate conferees. He would not agree to a penny.

The remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin are enlightening in another respect. His discussion betrays a familiarity with political aspirations in my Congressional district. He seems to be attempting to make political capital here which can be used by his party in my

district in the coming campaign. He is apparently already attempting to campaign against me in the coming election at the expense of the beneficiaries of the Social Security Act. That is one congressional district in which the election cannot be dictated from Washington. If it could, I am certain the gentleman would be glad to take precautions which would keep me at home and thereby save him and his colleagues in the next Congress from the reminder of their failure to provide for the administration of the laws which have brought to that district and the State of Missouri the greatest prosperity the country has ever known.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of expressing my thanks and appreciation to the members of the committee on both sides for their untiring work in writing this bill. I can happily say that in our committee we had no political considerations at anytime. All the members devoted themselves to a sincere effort to write a good bill, which I think we did. All of the members rendered a very valuable service. I also want to thank the committee clerks, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Sprangle, who performed valuable service to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as having been read and that it be open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against any provisions of the bill? If not, the Chair will recognize Members to offer amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the present appropriation bill and all other appropriation bills, the question of tax dollars and the amount raised is of vital importance because it is from the money raised as a result of our revenue laws or the tax dollars paid by our taxpayers that appropriations are capable of being made. For years I have been first interested then concerned with a provision in the internal revenue laws that the Congress in its wisdom enacted many years ago, the purpose of which was to prevent corporations from unreasonably withholding surplus for the purpose of avoiding the payment of surtaxes in the hands of some stockholders. I can well remember in the latter thirties when this matter came before this body. At that time I opposed the formula known as the third basket tax that was contained in the bill that was designed to meet the serious situation where corporations unreasonably withheld the distribution of their profits or their surpluses in the nature of a dividend. We liberalized, as I remember, section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code at that time making it easier for the Bureau of Internal Revenue in court proceedings, directed against particular corporations, to present their cases to the courts, meeting some difficulties in the law that existed at that time as the result of our court procedure.

This is a matter of great importance to millions of stockholders of different corporations who are denied payment of proper dividends. The question is whether or not a few stockholders, and particularly large ones who have substantial incomes from other directions, can exercise their influence to prevent a corporation declaring a proper dividend so that they can avoid the payment of a higher surtax or to prevent getting into a higher surtax bracket.

As indicating the seriousness of this situation I call attention that in 1947, with corporate net income in the United States of over $17,000,000,000 that the corporations declared dividends of a little over $6,000,000,000. I cannot understand why there is such a small amount of dividends paid by corporations in proportion to net income. In 1929 when the net corporate income, that is, income after taxes, was about $9,000,000,000, or a little less, the dividends paid were between five and six billion dollars. In 1939, following the depression period, with corporate net income of $6,000,000,000, there was about $4,000,000,000 in dividends paid. I agree that is a high ratio.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not advocating that the ratio of dividends to net income should be 80 percent. In 1940, with a corporate net income of about $6,000,000,000, the dividends declared were about $4,250,000,000. In 1941, with corporate net income of about $9,000,000,000 the dividends declared were close to $5,000,000,000. In 1946, with corporate net income of about $11,500,000,000, the dividends declared were about $5,500,000,000. Yet, in 1947, with a $17,500,000,000 corporate net income, the dividends declared were only a little over $6,000,000,000.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. Of course, the gentleman recognizes the necessity of having a surplus to carry a corporation over bad times, does he not?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true. The gentleman's statement is absolutely correct, and I have that in mind, and I am glad the gentleman asked the question so that I can make it a part of my remarks. I recognize also that the corporations use some of their surplus for plant extensions and other capital purposes, such as the replacement of capital that may have been impaired in other years, but that is a matter that concerns individual corporations, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue, if it should go after a corporation on the ground that it is unreasonably withholding dividends, would be justified in considering that. I recognize that the cost of construction has gone up, and I agree that that and similar factors should be considered, but I still say that the cost of living has gone up for the average stockholder, and that certainly with a $17,500,000,000 corporate net income, the amount of dividends last year ought to have been in excess of the $6,000,000,000 plus that it actually was. All of the factors my friend from New York says in sound business must be recognized, I know business must recognize, but I do feel that the small stockholder should be given consideration, and that in those corporations where there is an unreasonable withholding—and I am applying this only to that situation—the wishes of the large stockholders, or those with large incomes from other directions should not dominate the dividend policy of the corporations.

My only purpose in rising is to call attention to this and to the fact that the Bureau of Internal Revenue with justice to all corporations, and justice to each individual corporation, should vigorously look into this matter and carry out the mandates of the law, not only for the benefit of the small stockholder who is entitled to that consideration but also for the benefit increased dividends will bring to our Government in the form of more tax dollars.

Mr. Chairman, my main purpose in speaking on this occasion is for the interest of the small stockholders of corporations. They certainly are affected greatly by the increased cost of living. It is persons in the fixed-income class that are the ones most adversely affected by inflation. And yet while the cost of living during the past several years has gone up sharply, the percentage of dividends to the total net income declared by corporations has decreased.

The total dividend payments in 1947 was $6,800,000,000, or 39 percent of the total corporate net income which net income is estimated at seventeen billion four hundred million, and this represents the lowest proportion paid out in any year since the Department of Commerce series was started in 1929. Let us contrast this with the higher percentages paid out in previous years, such as 69 percent in 1929, 76 percent in 1939, 63 percent in 1940, 48 percent in 1941, and 45 percent in 1946, all active years.

It seems to me that in the interest of the Government, and certainly in the interest of the small stockholder, the Bureau of Internal Revenue should be active in seeing that corporations do not unreasonably withhold surplus in order that certain of its stockholders, usually the large ones, and officers of the corporation, are not driven into a high surtax bracket. Such a policy is one to benefit the few at the expense of the many.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER INTERCONNECTIONS BETWEEN PACIFIC NORTHWEST AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, on April 12, 1948, our good and esteemed friend, the gentleman from the Second California District, inserted on page A2239 of the Appendix of the RECORD the suggestions he made to the House Interior Sub-Appropriation Committee covering needed power relief to California necessitated by the crippling shortages existing in that State. The press accounts following this submission and similar accounts covering earlier testimony before the House Public Lands Committee have resulted in considerable apprehension in the Pacific Northwest. The northwestern editorials bearing on this subject, which have come to my attention, indicate a fear that this proposal is the first step of a program to undercut northwestern resources, to increase the basic power rate, and—later—to amend the Bonneville Act. I can readily see from some past legislative history that a reason exists for such apprehension.

I have seen no indications that the proposal of the gentleman from California contemplated such a wide and unsound program, but it is easy to see how misconceptions could arise from the language used in describing these ideas. Before such a complex subject can be completely discussed on its merits, more factual information is needed than is presently available. I understand that the interconnection proposal has not been surveyed and that a factual feasibility analysis has not been covered in any report submitted to the Congress. Until such surveys have been accomplished and a resulting complete feasibility and protective report is submitted to the Congress, any discussion of this problem must be more or less tentative. I am discussing this situation not in a spirit of criticism but rather for the purpose of opening up a fair and full analysis so that the people of the affected States can be fully informed, since what has been offered to date has caused apprehension and in some cases suspicion.

In order to keep the record straight until such background material is available, I wish to offer a few observations based on such substantial material as is quickly at hand. The Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee, of which I happen to be chairman, has long had original jurisdiction over the water resources of the Columbia River. For over 20 years certain phases of the over-all characteristics of this river have been under study by my committee. As a matter of fact, because of this original jurisdiction it was necessary, following the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Arizona Parker Dam case, for the House Rivers and Harbors Committee to authorize the Grand Coulee project in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1935. Legislative jurisdiction over the Central Valley project rests with a different House committee; namely, the Public Lands Committee.

Before I proceed further I wish to point out several significant economic facts. In my opinion these facts ultimately will carry considerable weight when the interconnection matter is later discussed following receipt of feasibility reports applying to this proposal.

The economic destiny of Oregon and Washington is closely tied to the economic progress of California. The Pacific coast and adjacent Western States commercially have much in common. For example, the lumber industry of southwestern Oregon is now feeling the pinch of the California power shortage. The operations of lumber mills in this area have been curtailed.

Any cause which injures California also has an adverse effect on the business of the adjoining States. Oregon, similar to California, has encountered mass population migration, and the existing utility facilities needed to serve the resulting increased demand in both States have been severely taxed. The Columbia Basin is short of native fuels, but long on water, while California has been blessed with liquid-fuel resources but is short on water supply. Indications are that California will encounter diminishing petroleum reserves and that it cannot develop water sources and hydro power to fully support its population increases. It therefore follows that the Columbia Basin States should help California, provided they can do so without injury to their own natural position. Basic engineering data is not now available to measure the extent of this help. This data should be made available at an early date so that the people of both regions can be given the full facts in order that discussions covering this intertie will not become unnecessarily controversial. We need to know the many complex variable factors governing such a power interrelationship. Until we have brought all these factors together into a composite balance sheet we will not be able to accurately appraise the full effects.

BASIC FACTS

After mentioning such brief preliminaries let us now examine a few basic established facts applying first to the comparative river flows in the lower Columbia and the Sacramento near the Shasta Dam site. After we have made this comparison we will be in a position to translate these known characteristics into tentative development and utilization factors applying to the electric generation, transmission, and export of power.

It is an accepted fact that the quantity and type of river flow are determined by the extent, topography, character, storage potentialities, and climatic conditions applying to any given watershed. The drainage area of the Sacramento River at the Shasta Dam site is officially stated at 6,665 square miles, while the drainage area of the Columbia River at The Dalles, Oreg.—some 70 miles above Bonneville Dam—is 237,000 square miles. The mountain snowfields which contribute to the flow of the Sacramento at Shasta Dam site have north and south distance less than 150 miles, while the comparative figure applying to the Columbia is about 950 miles. The Columbia Basin snowfall supply extends from northern Utah through the Selkirks of northern Canada (the Columbia is an international stream). Snow-melt contributions have a greater diversity if the distance traveled by the seasonal sun position is greater. All of these factors naturally give the Columbia a much greater sustained flow and greater hydro potentiality than is possible on the Sacramento. It follows that the Columbia is a large sustained-flow stream, whereas the Sacramento must be considered in the torrential classification. Such a brief review indicates that the power benefits accruing from the Columbia must greatly exceed those possible on the Sacramento.

FLOW DIVERSITY

Information on the flow diversity between the two watersheds is very meager and no yardstick is therefore presently available to measure benefit flows in critical or average years. Two-thirds of California's population and agricultural activities are located south of Sacramento, while the available water in this south and central California area is only one-third of the State's total. Such facts indicate a tendency to require unidirectional flow of benefits.

Early in the last war serious power shortages developed in the southeast section of this country. These past shortages were remarkably similar to the present situation in California. To overcome the resulting production handicap, the war agencies resorted to transmission line interconnections. This practice was continued throughout the war. From the results of these interconnections there can be no controversy as to this practice being a constructive and a wise procedure. Unfortunately, as far as I can determine, there have been no quantitative results published covering these interconnections. From what is available, I would judge that the country as a whole benefited to the extent of around 5 percent increase in the then available power capacity.

FLOW OF BENEFITS AND UPSTREAM STORAGE

It is apparent that before the flow of benefits can be determined, a thorough-going survey and analysis must be undertaken covering all the elements connected with flow characteristics. The meager information that is available indicates the need for more information to determine the flow of benefits.

Natural river flows can be modified or regulated through the use of upstream water storage. The California impression that no storage opportunities exist on the Columbia is totally erroneous. Existing preliminary surveys and studies made by the Army engineers indicate that great and low-cost storage potentialities exist in the Columbia Basin. This basin is rich in large head-water lakes and natural reservoir sites. Around 25,000,000 acre-feet of upstream storage would make the Columbia a commercially firm power-producing stream on the basis of fitting a most probable future load curve. Grand Coulee Reservoir has 11,000,000 acre-feet of total storage, but only 5,200,000 acre-feet can be effectively

used on account of diminishing returns resulting from head-water draw-down. Hungry Horse project in western Montana, now under construction, will provide about 3,000,000 acre-feet of additional usable storage by 1951. This Hungry Horse storage alone will firm up 377,000 kilowatts in four downstream plants, which value approaches the total California estimated gain figure. The Hungry Horse storage effect was apparently ignored in the preliminary California estimates. This amount of Hungry Horse contribution power transformed from dump into firm, at a 60 percent use factor, is equivalent to an additional annual kilowatt-hour production of some 1,450,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The Canadian headwater lakes of the Columbia are located in virgin country, and between 4,000,000 and 6,000,000 acre-feet of storage could be obtained at such sites at an exceptionally low cost when and if international agreements are worked out. There is also a large similar lake within the American boundary, largely surrounded by virgin lands, which could cheaply yield 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 acre-feet, or perhaps more. In addition, preliminary surveys on the Kootenai Branch of the Columbia in northern Idaho and western Montana show outstanding storage opportunities. The Columbia Basin informational surveys to accurately determine the economic breaking point in the storage utilization curve are yet to be made. The determination of such a breaking point is a substantial factor in measuring the available firm, secondary, and dump power. This analysis must be made to determine the important element of feasibility. Until this is consummated it will be impossible to accurately figure what power can be most economically used locally and what amount can be justified for export.

WASTE OF POWER

The statement that the Bonneville system wastes annually about 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours cannot be substantiated. The significance of such a figure can be appreciated when it is known that this amount of power is equivalent to 54 percent of the actual 1947 fiscal year output of the Bonneville generating station. The Pacific Northwest, because of a lack of fuel, pioneered in hydrogeneration and long, high-voltage transmission. Consequently, over a long period the people of the Northwest have been thoroughly educated as to power, and the language and thinking of the industry are in common use. Actually the Northwest is badly short of commercial and defense power, and will be for some time. Many of our people have visited the Bonneville plant located on one of our principal highways. These visits have confirmed the widespread knowledge that since its completion this plant has operated continuously around the clock except for mechanical breakdowns under overloads approximating 20 percent. There have been no visible signs of waste. Consequently the implication that any of the Bonneville output can be exported, leads to suspicion.

The use of the 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours figure results from either a misconception of power application on the Columbia or an unintentional error in calculations. I personally do not think that the intent was to suggest exporting any firm or such other power as will be converted into firm power in the near future. It was unfortunate that the word "waste" and the figure of 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours crept into the discussion, as they evidently resulted in impressions in the Northwest different from what was intended. Therefore, what I say in this connection is not designed to be critical but, rather, to help in reaching a common understanding, as I feel that I know some of the elements causing such a misunderstanding.

On page A2240 of the Appendix of the RECORD this statement can be found:

> The power potential of the Columbia River must be used as it flows by the power plants.

Technically, this expression means that the two main Columbia River generating stations were considered to be what is known in the industry as "run of the river" plants. This is not the case. Grand Coulee, next to Boulder, is the largest storage plant in the country, and Bonneville is an exceptionally large pondage plant, with pondage values ranging from 100,000 to 500,000 acre-feet, depending on the controlled water level of the plant's forebay. In a "run of the river" plant the energy equivalent to water not going into the existing load curve is considered to be dump energy resulting from waste of water. In the case of a storage or pondage plant, a substantial part of such hypothetical wastage can be placed in storage or pondage, for use during other hours in a given season or week. Therefore, applying a load use percentage to the peak load, as was evidently done, cannot be taken as a measure of availability when applied to storage or pondage plants.

Another possible source of error could have arisen from the use of the 1947 Columbia River flows. That year's flows were abnormally high—so high that it was not necessary for the smaller tributary plants to carefully regulate their low-capacity reservoirs. Under normal, subnormal, or critical water conditions these smaller plants shut down during the graveyard shift to permit the reservoirs to fill up, and then call on the main river plants to carry this load through the use of excess water. To consider that such high-year excess is a measure of availability will result in injuries to the smaller plants located within the Columbia River Basin and can have an adverse effect on the entire region.

There are many other variable hydraulic considerations that enter into this complex problem, such as utilization of the flood seasonal flows in processing aluminum and other like defense materials, the loss of heads during flood flows, saving of oil in the steam plants of the Pacific Northwest, economic use of secondary water during subnormal and critical years, the advisability of the overinstallation of water wheels to provide seasonal power, the prior water rights in the watershed, the important elements of navigation, flood control, and reclamation, the effect on fish and wildlife, and many other related topics. Again, Bonneville sells power on a kilowatt-year rate and thereby contracts to serve around the clock. A substantial part of the power incorrectly designated as waste really belongs to the contractees and must be made available at their call. It will be a difficult matter to bring all the hydraulic and electric elements into one balance sheet for purposes of determining what is best for the various States. This can only be accomplished after detailed surveys and a complete analysis. Congress needs to be supplied with a substantial amount of additional information before it can accurately appraise this complex matter.

TRANSMISSION LINES

The justified economic transmission of export off-peak power presents almost as many complex variables as do the hydraulics of the situation. It is impossible, in such a discussion, to cover these points fully, as so much basic material governing such transmission is also not available. I can therefore only touch the high spots applying to the transmission of export power.

The air-line distance from the Grand Coulee plant to The Dalles, Oreg., is about 240 miles. The similar mileage from The Dalles, via Detroit, to Eugene, Oreg., is about 190 miles, and from Eugene to the California boundary is 180 miles. The air-line distance from the California boundary to the Shasta plant is about 100 miles. Transmission lines—especially in rough country—cannot follow the air lines and the route miles usually exceed the air-line mileage by some 10 to 20 percent depending on locations and terrain. The route mile distance from the Grand Coulee plant to the Shasta plant is therefore around 820 miles, and from The Dalles—the approximate lower river generation center when McNary Dam is completed—is approximately 540 miles.

Three hundred miles was formerly considered the economic transmission limit, but recent developments indicate that this limit may be economically increased to somewhere around 500 miles. Therefore, any economical export to California must come from the lower Columbia or lower Willamette plants when these are installed. This set-up can be accomplished through the displacement of energy. What power can be economically displaced and transmitted over such long distances is now an open question and must be tested out by models—especially since there will be take-offs along the route. Until such a test is made I do not feel that anyone is in a position to say that 50,000 kilowatts or 100,000 kilowatts, or even more, can be displaced over a single 220,000-volt line into California. Such capacity variations are of such proportions that any error made in this value can upset feasibility calculations. The short-hour use of such export power must also be considered, as there is a breaking point in feasibility calculations determined by the hour's use of the resulting investment.

All the existing transmission lines between the lower Columbia River and the Shasta plant are low-voltage lines. The capability of such lines is low, and the physical transmitting distance may be

below 150 miles. Appropriations for a 230,000-volt line are presently under consideration by the Congress. This 230,000-volt line extends from Goldendale, Wash., to Eugene, Oreg., via the Detroit plant now under construction. This line is not scheduled for completion until 1951. It is impossible to route such volumes of power via the Portland area on account of existing bottlenecks growing out of heavy demands in that area. It is apparent that any future lines routed towards the California boundary must be routed through The Dalles.

The existing transmission situation will therefore prevent an early solution of the interconnection problem. Accordingly there is sufficient time to make a thoroughgoing survey, analysis, and report on this problem which must be forthcoming before the proposal can be considered on its merits and the full effect on the long-time economy of the Pacific Northwest determined. The material that is available indicates that the interconnection proposal is a long-range matter which, to be effective, should await the completion of the McNary and the upstream storage plants.

H. R. 6367

The gentleman from California has introduced a bill, H. R. 6367, which embodies the proposals he outlined in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 12, 1948. I have gone over this bill and find that a sincere effort has been made in section 3 to meet the points I have raised in this discussion. Whether it does or does not can only be determined after a survey has been made and all the angles analyzed and a comprehensive report submitted to the Congress. There is so much involved in the proposal that the hearings on this bill should be so extensive that every interest involved can have its day in court.

This bill has been referred to the Committee on Public Lands, although my committee has long had jurisdiction and contact with all the phases affecting the Columbia River. There is a great deal more involved than reclamation and constitutionally I doubt that the reclamation aspects can govern. I trust that the Public Lands Committee will consider the limits of its jurisdiction and respect the long-established jurisdiction of my committee applying to the Columbia River.

CONCLUSION

Such facts as are available indicate that his matter cannot be considered as a problem susceptible of immediate solution. It is a long-range problem rather than a short-range problem. It contains so many variables that the full and long-time effect on the Columbia Basin can only be determined by a complete study and full and extended hearings. I have not discussed many other points covered by the gentleman from California. On the items omitted I feel that many of the points he raised have merit. I appreciate his position and respect his motives, but so much is involved that can affect the future destiny of the Columbia Basin that this bill must be given extraordinary attention. The mere shortness of this bill is no indication of the many far-reaching issues involved. We are here dealing with the transfer of benefits from a large interstate and international watershed to one which is intrastate. The long-conflicting experiences on the Colorado are certainly a precedent in such matters. The decisions of the Supreme Court affecting the transfer of benefits between watersheds suggest caution in handling such transfers.

I have no doubt but that the region I represent desires to help California and its neighboring States, but in so doing Oregon does not want to surrender any rights belonging to the people which may become extremely valuable in the distant future. I think that all who have some measure of responsibility in this matter wish to have extensive hearings on H. R. 6367.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOEVEN, 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. 6500) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RACING SHELLS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5933) to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells.

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, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House to read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5933) to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment to the text of the bill insert the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting, after the sixth proviso, the following: '*Provided further*, That in addition to the exemption authorized by the fourth preceding proviso, a returning resident who has remained beyond the territorial limits of the United States for a period of not less than twelve days, shall be permitted to bring into the United States up to but not exceeding $300 in value of articles (excluding distilled spirits, wines, malt liquors and cigars) acquired abroad by such resident of the United States as an incident of the foreign journey for personal or household use or as souvenirs or curios, but not bought on commission or intended for sale, free of duty: *Provided further*, That any subsequent sale, within three years after the date of the arrival of such returning resident in the United States, of articles acquired and brought into the United States pursuant to the provisions of the immediately preceding proviso shall subject the returning resident declaring the articles to double the import duty which would have been collected had this additional exemption not been in effect: *Provided further*, That the additional exemption authorized by the second preceding proviso shall apply only to articles declared in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury by such returning resident who has not taken advantage of the said exemption within the six-month period immediately preceding his return to the United States:'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective with respect to articles declared on or after the day following the date of enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN
By O. B.,
O. BREWSTER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5933) to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text adds a new section to the bill as it passed the House, which section amends paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. Paragraph 1798 permits a resident of the United States to bring into the country, free of duty, up to but not exceeding $100 in value of articles (including distilled spirits, wines, and malt liquors aggregating not more than one wine gallon and including not more than 100 cigars) which are acquired abroad by such resident as an incident of a foreign journey for personal or household use or as souvenirs

or curios, but not bought on commission or intended for sale. This exemption may be utilized only by a returning resident who has not taken advantage of the exemption within the 30-day period immediately preceding his return to the United States. To be eligible for the exemption the returning resident must have remained abroad for not less than 48 hours, if the articles to which the exemption is to be applied have been acquired in any country other than a contiguous country which maintains a free zone or free port. If the articles have been acquired in a contiguous country which maintains a free zone or free port the period of absence is specified in special regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury under the statute but must not exceed 24 hours.

The amendment to paragraph 1798 made by the Senate amendment provides an exemption of $500, in addition to the $100 exemption, for a returning resident who has remained abroad for a continuous period of at least 12 days. This additional exemption may be utilized by a returning resident only once within any 6-month period, and may not be applied to distilled spirits, wines, malt liquors, and cigars. The amendment also provides that if a returning resident who takes advantage of this additional $500 exemption sells, within 3 years, any article brought into the United States free of duty under the exemption, he shall be subjected to double the import duty which would have been colleced on such article had the additional exemption not been in effect. The amendment also provides that the additional exemption shall apply only to articles declared in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The House recedes with an amendment which fixes the amount of the additional exemption at $300, in lieu of the $500 provided in the Senate amendment, which limits the application of the amendment to paragraph 1798 to articles declared on and after the day following the date of enactment of the bill, and which makes minor clarifying changes in the Senate amendment.

Amendment to title: This is a technical amendment, necessitated by the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill. The House recedes.

DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,
BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, this conference report on H. R. 5933 provides for the importation of an additional $600 value in merchandise per annum with certain restrictions, free of duty, by any citizen of the United States, on the theory that it will aid foreign and friendly countries through the greater distribution of our dollars in such countries.

This additional $600 will make a total of $1,800 in merchandise that any citizen may bring into our country free of duty each year.

My past votes on measures for relief of our friendly countries is adequate evidence of my desire and willingness to aid these countries in distress, but, Mr. Speaker, are we not extending ourselves too far in following the recommendations of the various travel agencies in granting this additional show of liberality to the great harm and loss of business to our border merchants?

These merchants that have been and are being taxed to support the recovery plan are now to suffer the additional loss of business and unjustifiable competition.

These same merchants for whom I make this plea have already suffered and are suffering a great loss of business through the import restrictions placed on their merchandise by our border Republic.

I protest with all my vigor the adoption of this conference report on H. R. 5933.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum.

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. 62]

Abernethy	Griffiths	Mundt
Anderson, Calif.	Hartley	Murdock
Battle	Hébert	Norrell
Bell	Hedrick	Pfeifer
Bender	Hendricks	Phillips, Tenn.
Boykin	Jarman	Ploeser
Bramblett	Jennings	Plumley
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Okla.	Powell
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	St. George
Celler	Kearney	Scoblick
Clark	Kearns	Sheppard
Clevenger	Kee	Sikes
Clippinger	Kefauver	Smith, Ohio
Cravens	Keogh	Stigler
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Stratton
Dawson, Ill.	Klein	Taylor
D'Ewart	Lane	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Lea	Trimble
Donohue	Lichtenwalter	Welch
Dorn	Lusk	West
Douglas	Lyle	Whitaker
Engle, Calif.	Meade, Md.	Whitten
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Winstead
Fogarty	Morrison	Wood
Gallagher	Morton	
Gore	Multer	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Guy E. Wyatt.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and her reply thereto, and a resolution.

Mr. ARNOLD 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.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

MAKING AVAILABLE TO CONGRESS INFORMATION FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. 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 joint resolution (H. J. Res. 342) directing all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to make available to any and all standing, special, or select committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, information which may be deemed necessary to enable them to properly perform the duties delegated to them by the Congress.

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 House Joint Resolution 342, with Mr. ALLEN of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, May 12, there was pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to the committee amendment on page 3 of the bill.

Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] made the statement that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], and I had signed the majority report. That statement is correct. But in that connection I want to read into the RECORD a portion of the report with reference to our signing of it:

> The committee was unanimously of the opinion that, if legislation of this type was to be enacted, the proposed resolution, as amended, was the fairest type of a bill that could be enacted into law. Upon roll call, 17 Members voted to report out the resolution as amended. Four, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. LANHAM, Mr. HARDY, and Mr. WILSON, who voted in the affirmative, reserved the right to offer amendments or to oppose the legislation upon the floor, if upon further consideration, they deemed that course advisable.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is reading from the majority report?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a correct statement, is it not?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes. I just wanted to get it into the RECORD again because several Members have asked me about it.

I want to say that when this resolution was before the committee, it was approached not from any political angle, but because we all recognized that there was a deep and significant question involved. Knowing the work that our distinguished chairman, the gentleman

from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] had put on the resolution, we felt that the matter should be passed upon by the House. But realizing that we were getting into the twilight zone or no-man's land where the question of the extent of the power of the executive department and of the legislative department was not clearly defined, some of us were uncertain about the wisdom of the legislation. But we did think that the House should be allowed to pass upon it. That is why I and others voted that the resolution be reported out favorably. However we reserved the right, as you will see from the report, to oppose the resolution on the floor of the House.

Since the debate on yesterday, I have become convinced that the dangers in the resolution far outweigh any benefits that the Congress might reap from the enactment of this legislation. Therefore I shall oppose the resolution and vote against it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman, however, is not opposed to the amendment, as I understood him to say at the outset of his remarks?

Mr. LANHAM. No; I favor the amendment. I think the amendment ought to be adopted.

The thing that finally convinced me that we ought not to enact this legislation was the fact that the gentleman from Ohio objected to and the Committee of the Whole voted down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] which would have required a vote of two-thirds of the Committee before any executive department could be required to furnish confidential information.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman, of course, realizes that the resolution provides that the Speaker of the House must also approve the action of the committee, which is another safeguard against any wrongdoing.

Mr. LANHAM. I agree with the gentleman, and if those safeguards had not been in the bill I would never have signed the report asking that it be reported.

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

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In practical operation we simply take away from the President the power granted to him under the Constitution and transfer it to the Speaker of the House and the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

Mr. LANHAM. I think that is a fair interpretation of the provision referred to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, whenever the House or Senate wishes to take action, it is the usual procedure to have the Speaker or the President of the Senate, rather than the President of the United States, approve any legislative action.

Mr. LANHAM. That is true. But I think here we are probably invading the executive field.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the case, where the Speaker transmits, but this language says the Speaker must approve. "Upon approval of the Speaker." That is an entirely different proposition from the Speaker transmitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this particular amendment close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I was puzzled yesterday when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] extolled the virtues of the Members of Congress and of the Congress as a whole, and then turned right around and asked us to vote for this bill which provides for fines and imprisonment of Members of Congress and their staffs if they discuss information presented to committees. That is all this resolution does—an unprecedented thing.

If the Congress has the right to demand any and all files it sees fit from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Armed Forces and other members of the Cabinet, it has that right already. If it does not have that right, then passing this law will not give it to Congress. In either event, this law is in effect meaningless except for the penalty provisions which would apply to information requested and voluntarily furnished by those departments.

In fact, I think this resolution has only one purpose. It places many of us in the position of darned if you do and darned if you do not. If we vote for it, our action will be hailed to the country as one condemning the President for doing what every President has done—protected the rights of the Executive from encroachment by the legislative branch. If we vote against it, it will be argued that we have something to conceal. Pardon me for saying so, but it is purely a political resolution.

I know that the gentlemen on the left of the aisle who are supporting this resolution do not like what I say. We do not like some of the things they have said here.

All this political bickering is not conducive to the welfare of the country. I propose that we Democrats make you Republicans a sporting proposition—a sporting proposition once suggested by an old pioneer from New Mexico.

Back in the Territorial days of New Mexico, two pioneers, James Hagerman and Charles Eddy, were bosom friends and contributed greatly to the development of the State. They prospered as the State prospered. But in time they became separated and ended by being bitter enemies.

Hagerman had gone to New York to interest capital in the building of a railroad from Roswell to Amarillo. He spent many months in New York interviewing capitalists and bankers. In the course of his rounds promoting his railroad, Hagerman was surprised to learn that his old friend, Charles Eddy, was also in New York attempting to promote another railroad in the same area. He did not like some of the things that Eddy was saying about him and he finally wrote his former friend, Eddy, a letter in which, after reciting the things that Eddy had been doing and the things that Hagerman thought he should not have done, Hagerman ended his letter to Eddy with these words:

> Now, we should have peace between us, until this promotion is ended. Our attitude is hurting New Mexico and I make you this proposition: If you will quit telling lies about me, I will quit telling the truth about you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I can wholeheartedly support this amendment, and I congratulate my friend from Ohio, although his consideration and action was delayed in awakening to the danger that this bill carried to the press, and its violation of one of the great fundamental rights guaranteed by our Constitution.

During the 14 years of Democratic control of the House and the Congress there has never been a bill reported out that even remotely invaded the freedom of the press. Despite the fact that 84 percent of the press are against the Democratic Party, we have always insisted that the provisions of the Constitution be strictly adhered to. I was most amazed when the Republican members of the committee reported out this resolution with this amendment in it because the language very clearly showed that it covered everybody, and that included the press. So I urge the adoption of this amendment. After the amendment is adopted then the only one to be subject to its provisions and who can be prosecuted or jailed will be Members of Congress.

Mr. GAVIN. And their employees.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, wait a while—and the employees of the committee. But you do not suppose anybody is going to indict or prosecute a poor employee of a committee? And, particularly, they would be very very limited as employees of the committee are limited in number in relation to the members of the committee. So for all practical purposes after this amendment is adopted, and I strongly urge its adoption, and I am confident it will be adopted, the only ones subject to the penalty will be Members of Congress.

I hope that after we adopt the amendment and preserve the freedom of the press if I am a member of any committee that votes to make anything confidential, that the press will not come around bothering me because they might help put me in jail after I have helped keep them out of the possibility of going to jail. So any time I am on a committee and this question comes up I am going to put a big sign outside my door: "The press will not be admitted." I will have to do this for my own protection.

Furthermore, I want to suggest to the members of the press now that we are saving them, that after this is adopted and if this bill should ever become law and they are free, that if any committee should vote to impose a confidential character on any matter, do not come around to any Member of Congress and use the power of the press upon him because I am afraid then they might go after the Member of Congress and the member of the press on a conspiracy charge, because a conspiracy is still a crime and anybody who participates in a conspiracy to make known information that is confidential with a Member of Congress is guilty of a conspiracy whether he is a member of the press or not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that as a colleague in Congress and also as a newspaper publisher I shall be very happy to use whatever influence I have toward keeping him out of jail in the future. I am sure he will remain out of jail.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is fine, because my friend means it. His solicitude for me pleases me.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman that I will be very happy any time it is necessary to go the gentleman's bond during trial to do so. I would do that for any friend.

Mr. McCORMACK. I admire a man who has the courage to do that.

In conclusion, I want to congratulate the Members of the House for exempting the press from the possibility of going to jail. I hope they will not engage in any conspiracy and I also hope they will not try to put any of us in jail if this resolution should ever become law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the genteman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority whip, will agree with me that throughout consideration of this resolution by the committee the partisan angle was not injected, was it?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman wants an answer for the RECORD?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes or no.

Mr. McCORMACK. There was no partisan consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The first I ever heard of this partisan political angle was when we got this resolution on the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. What partisan angle?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The one the gentleman from New Mexico was speaking about.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposing the pending amendment. In an effort to save the Government a little money I drafted this resolution myself. So I went back to the precedents and I hauled down the code. There in section 55, title XXVI, subsection (f) and subsequent sections I found where the New Deal—the Democratic administration, pardon me, you do not disown it—had written into law years ago—it seems years ago, it was only 10—the same provision that I wrote into this resolution.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] yesterday, perhaps inadvertently, expressed the thought that Members of Congress were afraid of the press and thought this provision ought to come out, although he did accept my word that Members of Congress were not fearful. "Brutus was an honorable man." We are all courageous men. We may perhaps be a little timid at times.

I call your attention to the fact that while the gentleman has made an oration here about only Members of Congress and employees of committees now being subjected to a penalty, he is one of the opponents of this bill. In my ignorance, in my lack of wisdom and experience, I thought anyone who disclosed this confidential information ought to be subjected to some penalty. As a Member of Congress, I have no objection to subjecting myself to a criminal penalty if I disobey the laws of the land and I am sure upon mature consideration the gentleman from Massachusetts would not have any objection to that either.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, under the provisions of this bill the only persons who will have access to any of this confidential information in the executive branch of the Government will be members of committees and the employees of committees.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And Drew Pearson.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Probably. Therefore, if any member of a committee makes this information public he should be subjected to the penalty.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The only reason this legislation is here, at least so far as I am concerned, and I have had something to do with starting it to rolling, is because in recent years the freedom of the press and of the people to information and the right of the Congress to information has been denied, and I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, denied by the executive departments and your President, and, may I add, my President? That is the only reason that this legislation has been found necessary. Yesterday, the gentleman said that 79 Congresses—I know you do not like it, but we love each other.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me say that I have the greatest respect for my friend from Michigan; one man who is intellectually honest.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And being a good Republican, your feeling is reciprocated—reciprocity is good Republican doctrine you know.

The gentleman said yesterday that 79 Congresses had never found this type of legislation necessary. That is right. Seventy-nine Congresses never were gagged and never were denied information essential to legislation, as has the Eightieth Congress.

I doubt the fairness and wisdom of the amendment. Because compromises are sometimes necessary, I do not oppose it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 3, line 8, after the word "confidential" delete the comma and insert in lieu thereof a period, and strike out the remainder of line 8 and all down to and including line 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] well and ably expressed and condemned the thought that has been in the minds of altogether too many people. Too many of the opponents of this bill seem to have it in their minds. I am not referring to the Members of the House, I am referring more particularly to the members of the press, who have made a great deal of adverse comment on it. There seems to be an impression somewhere that because a man was elected by his constituents to serve as a Member of this body he was no longer worthy of trust and confidence; that he himself did not have any discretion or did not possess loyalty to as great a degree as those in the executive departments who now maintain an abridgement of the press which we who support this legislation seek to at least partially end. I resent that. I do not care so much about myself, but that assumption is an insult to my people, and it is an insult to the people of every man who has been here more than one term. It is an intimation that they elect to Congress men who are disloyal, who are loose-mouthed, "blabber-mouths," who do not have the good sense, judgment, and courage to keep to themselves information which should be confidential. That is what it is. Are we not ready and willing to obey the criminal laws?

Why should we ask exemption from penalties which apply to others?

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] said that if this provision went through, Members of Congress should go home. I say that when the day comes that a Member of Congress is not willing to apply to himself the same penalties he seeks to impose on others he better go home and he better stay there. This provision is of no value unless we put some penalties in for those who violate it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, this section applies only if Members of Congress have obtained this information after going through the full procedure

provided in this resolution, and then disclose information that the majority of the committee has decided is confidential.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And that the Speaker has decided is confidential. I say a man that turns that out ought to have some penalty inflicted on him.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. A Member of Congress is not an employee of the United States, he is an officer of the United States, and he can be removed only by action of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; and a Member of Congress can without subjecting himself to that penalty come on the floor of the House, if he is that kind of an individual, and disclose anything, and the only penalty would be discipline or expulsion by the House.

As I stated before, the same provision is in our revenue law. There is a penalty there, and it applies to Congressmen, and the Supreme Court of the United States has so ruled. So where is the danger?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The adoption of this amendment, of course, would be saying to the country that the Congress did not want to take any responsibility under the Criminal Code for the observance of this law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, we would be making employees responsible, but not the Members of Congress. With that I cannot agree.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 31, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a misapprehension which I feel ought to be cleared up in the minds of the Members because the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code have been referred to several times. Congress has made income-tax returns secret. If Congress had not by affirmative act and specific legislation in the revenue acts in the past provided for secrecy, income-tax returns would be made public. So we made them secret. Then the Congress had to provide something to protect that secrecy. That is entirely different from the situation that exists today. The gentleman from Michigan has referred to the remarks made by the majority leader on yesterday about the lack of confidence of the Congress in Members. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and we all do, but that is a part of the journey of life and especially a part of public life. No matter how much we deplore it, we are not going to meet it except by example on our own part. But in connection with the provisions of the bill now confined to Members of Congress and members of the staff, and for all practical purposes, Members of Congress, I think keeping this in is an admission on our part that we cannot repose confidence in our own Members. Certainly I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] made a very able argument in support of his amendment. We must have confidence in ourselves. Yet providing a criminal penalty denies that very fact. We are the only ones left who can be prosecuted.

It does not bother me much because by the time this becomes law, and I cannot see it for many years to come, if it ever does become law, the chances are that I will not be subject to its provisions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has not the gentleman from Massachusetts opposed this resolution on the theory that confidential information should remain in the executive departments because if it came to Congress, the Members would divulge it?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I have not opposed it on that theory at all. I have opposed it on the ground the independence of the executive branch is dependent upon that branch having that power it has exercised heretofore the same as we have to have certain powers to keep our independence.

Furthermore, what is the greatest punishment that a member of a legislative body can get? Censure by his fellow members, or expulsion. Usually, there must be a serious act before a legislative body will go to the length of expulsion, but censure by fellow members is a very serious punishment. If any Member violated a confidence, if this resolution should become law, we have within our power the greatest means of punishment, public censure or expulsion. I do not care whether this provision, section 2, remains in the resolution or not. I am opposing the resolution for fundamental reasons. I hope that for our own respect, when this resolution goes back to the House there will be a separate vote on this amendment and the amendment will be defeated, because, in a sense, section 2 is unnecessary to this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KNUTSON: On page 3, line 22, strike out "SEC. 3" and insert "SEC. 4." "SEC. 4. Nothing contained herein shall alter the procedure for inspection of tax returns by committees of Congress prescribed by section 55 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not expect to oppose the amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then, there is no use arguing it, but I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, that the section be numbered "3" instead of "4," because there is a section 4 in the bill.

This amendment merely strikes out the present section 3 and substitutes the language which the Clerk has just read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman want the amendment to follow page 3, line 21?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I make the point of order that this amendment is not germane to this bill. It brings in a matter which concerns something that is already on the books and amends that law.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the point of order comes too late and it is not any good anyway.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair will hold that the amendment is germane and overrules the point of order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Have we passed section 2? My amendment was to section 2. I understood the gentleman's amendment succeeds section 2.

The CHAIRMAN. We have passed section 2.

Mr. JAVITS. The last amendment was offered by Dr. SMITH to section 2, and I understood we were still on that section and I rose to offer an amendment to section 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 2 is a committee amendment and has been adopted and is not subject to amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee, the committee will accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. It is a worth-while amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. In view of the broad-minded attitude of the committee in accepting the amendment, I will not take any more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is a committee amendment on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN as a committee amendment: Page 3, after line 21, insert the following new section.

"SEC. 5. If any provision of this joint resolution, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the joint resolution or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby."

And change the numbers of the succeeding sections accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, since this is merely a perfecting amendment, I do not care to spend time on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Do I understand we have passed section 2? Have we passed section 2?

The CHAIRMAN. Section 2 has been adopted as a committee amendment. We have passed section 2.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know whether any Member desires to offer an amendment to section 2, but I wish to ask the Chair in connection with it as a matter of preserving the rights of any Member who wishes to offer an amendment to section 2—my distinct recollection is that the committee amendment was agreed to. Thereafter the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] offered his amendment. A point of order could have been made then, I realize. None was made, however, and the amendment was adopted and acted upon, which was proper.

In the light of the foregoing, I ask the Chair whether or not that by implication constituted Committee consideration of the previous section; also that other Members who desire to offer amendments to section 2 may be permitted to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. No; the Chair will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that does not. The gentleman could ask unanimous consent to return to section 2 for that purpose.

Mr. McCORMACK. I simply wanted to keep the RECORD straight. The Chair has made his ruling, and a correct ruling, in my opinion, in view of the circumstances. I wanted the RECORD clear, and a ruling of the Chair, which I understand and appreciate.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COMBS. I have an amendment to offer as a new section following section 2. I wish to inquire as to whether it would be proper to offer this amendment as soon as these committee amendments have been disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman that that would be the proper time for the gentleman to be recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have another committee amendment at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 3, lines 24 and 25, strike out the words "This resolution shall become effective within 10 days after its adoption" and insert in lieu thereof "This joint resolution shall become effective on the 10th day after the date of its enactment."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The amendment in no way changes the meaning. It is merely language suggested by the drafting service to perfect the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COMBS: Page 3, strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. There is hereby created a joint committee to be composed of three Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President or President pro tempore of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker or Acting Speaker of the House of Representatives. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to formulate and present, not later than 90 days after the date on which this joint resolution becomes effective, to the Senate and to the House of Representatives, for adoption, such rules as the joint committee may deem advisable with respect to the powers, duties, and procedures of all committees of either House under this joint resolution.

"SEC. 4. Any and all laws, rules, or regulations in conflict with this joint resolution are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 5. (a) The powers of committees with respect to obtaining information, books, records, and memoranda in the possession of or under the control of any executive departments, agencies, Secretaries, or individuals, shall not be effective prior to the adoption by both Houses of Congress of rules relating to the powers, duties, and procedures of committees under this joint resolution.

"(b) This joint resolution shall become effective within 10 days after its adoption."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment now proposed is an amendment to a section which we have passed. It changes the procedure by which the Congress seeks to get this information, and, in addition to that, it is an attempt to overrule the rules of the House or change the rules of the House as to the functioning of legislative committees.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, is the Chair going to rule on the point of order? Of course, this amendment is not subject to a point of order because it has to do with the procedure of special committees of the House. That is what we are talking about here, and that is what we are legislating in reference to.

Mr. COMBS. May I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. COMBS. First, I want to say, in reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], that the amendment I have offered is not an amendment of a section which we have passed. It proposes the addition of sections following section 2, which we have just finished considering. It is, therefore, timely. I want to make a further observation with regard to the germaneness of my amendment. It does not propose, as the gentleman from Michigan contends, to change the rules of the House nor to bypass the Rules Committee. It proposes simply to provide special rules to govern committees in the exercise of the special powers granted by the very resolution we are now considering. The fact that it provides for a special joint committee to formulate such rules and submit them to the House and Senate for consideration and adoption does not, in my opinion, constitute the setting up of the kind of joint committee that would violate the rule of germaneness. The sole function of the committee provided for would be to devise and propose a set of rules for House and Senate consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is not speaking on the point of order. He is speaking on his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will speak on the point of order.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I think I am speaking on the point of order. The point made is that my amendment is not germane to the resolution under consideration. I am simply stating what my amendment proposes in order that I may point out that what it proposes is germane to the resolution, because it would simply implement the resolution by providing orderly procedures for the exercise by committees of the very powers of investigation conferred upon them by the pending resolution. Thus, the amendment seeks to set up a procedure to guide the committees in doing the very things which the resolution before us empowers them to do. At present there are no suitable or adequate rules under which the committee can proceed. Such rules are necessary.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that I confined the amendment purely to the procedure applicable to this resolution so that it would be germane. I have introduced a resolution today providing for a similar committee to develop rules applicable to all committee investigations, and Heaven knows we need that.

The investigating function of Congress is important. Congressional investigations, conducted of course through appropriate committees, are necessary not only to develop information for the guidance of Congress in the formulation of legislation but in certain instances for the information of the American people. Certainly Congress has the power to make appropriate investigations of the departments and agencies under its jurisdiction and their officials. And it also rests under the duty of making such investigations when needed.

In recent years the investigative activities of the Congress and its committees, both standing and special, have increased enormously—yet the rules of the House designed primarily to promote the legislative procedures have not been amended so as to provide any adequate procedure for the governing of committees in making investigations.

This has caused much public criticism of Congress—criticism that can be avoided if suitable procedures are developed, adopted, and enforced.

Courts have rules to govern the investigations they make. They have rules that protect the secrecy of grand jury investigations, rules which govern the appearance of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. These rules make it possible to conduct court inquiries in an orderly manner to secure information and to develop facts. They also provide for the adequate protection of witnesses summoned before the grand juries and before the courts. We need similar rules, adapted of course to the committee type of investigation, to govern the activities of Congress through its committees.

The promulgation of such rules will require careful thought and study by a small but capable committee which in turn can submit its recommendations and suggested rules to the House and Senate for consideration and adoption. It is the best way to get the job done and, in my judgment, the only way we are likely to get it done. The resolution I introduced today, and which I referred to a few minutes ago, if enacted will get the job done.

We must not forget that when a congressional committee makes an investigation it is acting in the name of and under the authority of the body which creates it. We, in the Congress, cannot escape our responsibility in this regard if we would and we should not want to do so.

At the present time it is possible for the numerous committees of the Congress, without any coordinated system or plan, to summon department heads and other responsible officials before them day after day. We need to bring some kind of order out of the chaos that is thus created. This situation, unless remedied, may continue to enlarge its scope and the numerous committee activities until it seriously interferes with the executive departments of the Government in the performance of their duties. We owe it to ourselves, to the prestige of the Congress of the United States, and to the American people to establish orderly and sensible rules.

As for the amendment I have offered to the pending resolution it would make a beginning in the right direction. I want to state frankly that I am opposed to the resolution because, in my judgment, it is clearly unconstitutional. In addition, it would set a dangerous precedent of the legislative branch of the Government invading the jurisdiction of the executive branch of the Government. But while I am opposed to the resolution, apparently a majority of you intend to support it. And if you are going to enact it into law by all means let us at least provide for the setting up of an orderly procedure to govern the committees in the exercise of the powers the resolution would confer upon them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentleman's amendment it proposes that we set up a joint committee which would change the rules of the House and the rules under which the standing committees of the House—not special committees of the House and Senate but the standing committees—would operate, therefore a point of order would lie against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALLEN of Illinois). In the opinion of the Chair, this amendment would create a joint standing committee. It would take away the authority of the Rules Committee which under the rules of the House has jurisdiction over this subject. The Chair therefore holds that the amendment is not germane and sustains the point of order.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: Page 3, after line 21, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any individual, while or after holding any office or employment under the United States Government, to appropriate or take custody of, for his own unofficial use or the unofficial use of any other person, any papers, documents, or records (other than those which are of a character strictly personal to him) to which he has or had access solely by reason of holding or having held such office or employment. Any individual who willfully violates this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000, or by imprisonment for not exceeding 1 year, or both, at the discretion of the court.

"And change the numbers of succeeding sections accordingly."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The committee will be glad, after hearing the gentleman, to accept his amendment.

Mr. HERTER. I am very grateful to the gentleman for that contribution.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to get at an abuse which has arisen over a great many years, not necessarily maliciously, but in many cases to the detriment of the public interest. Officials of the Government, particularly high officials of the Government—and this has taken place over a great many years—have gone out of office or have left office and taken with them papers which should be state papers, and which they have later turned to their own advantage through publication or through other use. As a matter of fact, only recently an extremely embarrassing situation occurred as the result of official papers being considered the personal property of high officials. Shortly after the cessation of hostilities, the Russians occupied the Kurile Islands. The question was raised from time to time under what authority they had occupied that particular piece of land very close to the Alaskan chain of islands. The United States Government alleged that the Russians did so without any agreement on the part of the United States. Moscow radio replied saying that that occupation was in conformity with an agreement reached between President Roosevelt and Stalin.

The State Department denied that any such agreement had ever been reached. Later, however, on making inquiry at the White House, it was found that a high official of the White House had a carbon copy of such an agreement. No one has ever yet been able to get at the original because all the official papers were removed from the White House and are now in packing cases at Hyde Park and no one has access to them, because the trustees to whom they have been turned over feel that they are no longer public documents. I am not saying this for partisan political reasons. The same thing has happened in Republican administrations as well as Democratic administrations. High Government officials, particularly Cabinet officers, have left office and have taken with them official papers feeling that when they left office they had a right to clean out all the files. They are, of course, entitled to all of their private papers, and that is entirely proper. They are even entitled, if they wish so to do, to take carbon copies. This particular amendment will affect only the original documents which in many cases are not copied and not available elsewhere except in the top official files. This would maintain these papers for the proper purpose for which they are intended, namely, the conduct of the public business.

I hope, therefore, that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the language which I sought to have stricken from the pending bill can have the effect of reflecting upon the integrity of Members of Congress, in my opinion. The high office held by the lawmakers of the United States should not be subjected to the possibility of such a stigma. The idea is so repugnant to my sense of duty and the trust vested in me that I shall now be constrained to vote against the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke briefly yesterday, and I shall not take much time today. The need of legislation which House Joint Resolution 342 aims to provide is emphasized by the excellent and timely story of "an invisible government in the United States," appearing in the Chicago Daily Tribune this morning. I have obtained unanimous consent to include it, and it will appear at the end of my remarks. I urge every Member to read this factual story by James Doherty. The first page headline reads: "Parole scandal reveals Capone gang's crime empire—mob spread influence to high places."

Mr. Chairman, by reading this entire story by James Doherty the Members will realize the need for this kind of legislation. Congress should pursue this Capone gang parole scandal until it finds out who in high position really ordered their paroles; who received and who paid bribes. Congress should find out if the grand jury in my own Cook County is to be used in suppressing information.

Something should be done about the United States Department of Justice in its apparent determination to hog-tie the FBI in the investigation of the Capone gang parole scandal by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has a duty in this matter to find out all that happened

in the Capone parole matter and how it happened. This bill, if it becomes law, will help.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. May I ask the gentleman if he knows whether Mr. Doherty of the Chicago Tribune timed this particular article to tie in with the discussion on this measure?

Mr. CHURCH. I do not know, but do not believe so. The mere fact that I said it is timely was to indicate that it has a bearing on this legislation. I will not take the time now to read this article nor quote parts of it for the gentleman's edification. I hope all Members will read it in its entirety. I ask the Congress to back up this committee headed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and to pass this bill so that the people may have the benefit of information they are now being deprived of because it is being refused by the Attorney General of the United States and other departments of the Government.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 13, 1948]

PAROLE SCANDAL REVEALS CAPONE GANG'S CRIME EMPIRE—MOB SPREADS INFLUENCE TO HIGH PLACES—HERE IS COMPLETE REVIEW OF CASE

(By James Doherty)

This is the almost incredible story of an invisible government in the United States, which draws its sinews from underworld gutters, yet finds familiar footing in high places, including the White House.

It is a story which has its roots in the blood and greed of the Capone era and which spreads its corruption laden branches from Pennsylvania Avenue to Dallas, Tex., and beyond.

It will tell how Capone gangsters muscled their way into control of unions and extorted millions of dollars from union members and the movie industry, immune to the ordinary processes of law until two members of the gang were tripped up and squealed.

MYSTERY AND MIRACLES

It will explain how, after four members of the gang were sentenced to prison for 10 years, mysterious forces began to move to accomplish miracles. It will tell how the four men, among the most notorious criminals in the Nation, whose records were known even to school boys, walked out of prison as freemen on almost the first day they became eligible for parole, although their own attorneys, in pleading for light sentences at the time of their trial, had told the court that their clients, because of their records, had less than one chance in a thousand of ever being paroled.

It will tell how the four criminals obtained transfer from one prison to another with amazing and mysterious ease; how they were visited in prison by deputies still in control of the Capone gang's gambling and other activities, and how, from their prison cells, they continued to direct these activities and even exerted a strong influence—in some political subdivisions a decisive influence—in Chicago elections.

It will tell how other pending charges against the four criminals, which would automatically have barred their parole, vanished into thin air at the behest of the Justice Department, through the contrivings of a Dallas, Tex., lawyer, a close friend of the Attorney General and counsel for other gangsters, whose name did not even appear of record in the proceedings.

PAROLES MADE EASY

It will tell how prison transfers and their final paroles were arranged and expedited beyond all common practice in such matters, by a St. Louis attorney for gangsters who visits President Truman in the White House and calls him "Harry."

It will tell how hundreds of thousands of dollars in income tax liens against the four gangsters were cut to less than 20 percent of the original figure, and then settled by means of bundles of money dropped on the desk of a Chicago lawyer who was steeped in the politics of Jake Arvey's twenty-fourth ward and who was twice indicted for vote frauds. (The indictments were later quashed on technicalities.) The lawyer, Eugene Bernstein, told the congressional committee members the money came from men he didn't know, never saw before, and who took no receipts for their contributions.

It will disclose how, shortly before these mysterious bundles of money began to rain on the attorney's desk, slot machines, long dormant in Cook County, began to run full blast—with or without the approval of the owners of the places in which they were installed.

POLITICAL TIES NOTED

It will tell how, at the height of a county election campaign shortly before the paroles, the Republican leaders in several Chicago wards, predominantly Italian, suddenly went to sleep; and how, on election day, these wards returned Democratic majorities never equaled before or since, a source of great gratification to administration figures in Washington who subsequently refused to cooperate in an investigation of the granting of the paroles.

In telling these things, it will adhere rigidly to facts backed by court records and sworn testimony in congressional hearings, concerning whose accuracy there can be no vestige of doubt.

The beginning of the story goes back to the days of the depression, when the Capone syndicate, its profits from bootlegging drying up, began to cast about for other sources of revenue. Scarface Al Capone, boss and founder of the gang, had gone to prison in 1931 as a million dollar income tax cheat. Frank (the enforcer) Nitti came out of prison and was the new chief.

RESORT TO KIDNAPINGS

For a time, the bootleggers, who also were vice mongers and operators of gambling joints, resorted to kidnaping to keep up the flow of wealth to their pockets.

They became known as the mob, or the syndicate. They kidnaped a few union leaders and, finding that large ransoms for such gentry were an "easy touch," they concluded the unionists were vulnerable, the Congressmen learned. A new field was opened for the Capone mob.

James Caesar Petrillo, czar of all union musicians, was kidnaped in 1933 and $50,000 ransom was paid, after which six Chicago policemen were assigned exclusively to him as bodyguards for 7 or 8 years.

Robert Fitchie, president of the Milk Wagon Drivers' Union, was kidnaped in 1931 and his union paid $50,000 ransom for him. Steve Sumner, business agent of the union, said the money was picked up by Murray (The Camel) Humphries, one of the top men in the Capone gang, and Frank Diamond, who was convicted with the other four gangsters with whom this story deals, but who was not paroled with them, according to the records.

UNION EXPLOITATION STARTS

Exploitation of unions seemed safe and sure. The foray against the Hollywood magnates had its birth when George Browne, head of the Chicago Stage Hands' Union, and Willie Bioff, an ex-panderer who had evaded a Cook County jail sentence, met on Chicago's West Side early in the days of the depression.

Bioff had organized several Jewish butchers into a "protective" association. Bioff furnished protection for a price, he admitted. Browne, in need of financial help himself, had taken over a chicken-killers' union. They decided to team up.

Extortion of food from merchants enabled them to start a soup kitchen for unemployed stage hands. They also exacted cash donations. Gradually they grew bolder. Browne had a club over the heads of motion-picture-theater owners, some of whom employed stage hands. Some had let their stage hands go when vaudeville waned.

BALABAN SHAKEN DOWN

Barney Balaban, of Balaban & Katz, owners of a movie chain, was approached for a donation to the soup kitchen. Under pressure, he agreed to contribute $7,500. The shake-down team demanded $50,000, then agreed to take $20,000.

They got the $20,000, too, after they had shown their strength. An era of extortion for them and their associates had begun.

The $20,000 put Browne and Bioff into the big league. They were able to meet and do business with the top men of the Capone gang. They attended a party in a Rush Street night club operated for the gang by Nick Circella, also known as Nick Dean. Nick saw Browne and Bioff buying champagne with $100 bills and questioned them about the source of their wealth. When the pair told their success story, Circella was convinced they had a fine new racket. He ordered them to accompany him to a house in Riverside where they faced Nitti, the top gangster, and Frank Rio, who had been Capone's constant companion.

NITTI CUTS HIMSELF IN

Bioff and Browne told how they had shaken down the big movie firm of Balaban and Katz.

Nitti listened. Then, quietly, he said:

"From now on, we are in for 50 percent of your take."

Nitti studied the operations of Browne and Bioff. The more he did so, the more he admired them. He got an idea. He would make Browne president of the International Alliance of Theater and Stage Employees.

Nitti called a meeting at the home of Harry Hochstein, who started his public career as a morals inspector in Chicago, and after a zigzag political history became chauffeur for Capone hoodlums. Hochstein had a house in Riverside. Later he was indicted for perjury for denying, under oath, that the meeting was held there.

PLAN TO RUN CONVENTION

Present at this meeting, in addition to Nitti, were Rio, Louis Buchalter (since executed in New York), Paul (The Waiter) Ricca, Louis (Little New York) Campagna, one of the Fishetti brothers, who were cousins of Capone, and a few minor characters in the Nitti gang.

"We have connections that can handle the delegates to the stage hands' convention in Louisville," Nitti explained. The convention was in 1934.

"Frank Costello and Lucky (Charles Luciano, since deported) will take care of the New York delegation."

Buchalter, also known as Lepke, said that he, personally, would vouch for the delivery of the New York votes at the convention.

"Longey (Abner) Zwillman will deliver the New Jersey votes," Nitti continued. "Johnnie Dougherty (now sheriff in St. Louis) will handle St. Louis."

KANSAS CITY CONNECTIONS

Testimony at the subsequent trial of the gangsters disclosed that Nitti had two other stalwarts in Kansas City who were to deliver Missouri and Kansas union delegates to

Browne. They were Tony Guzzio (who testified before a Federal grand jury here recently that he is still the agent for the gang's Chicago brewery), and Charlie Corrallo.

"They are the Lucky Lucianos of Kansas City," Bioff explained, meaning that they controlled vice, gambling, bootlegging, and racketeering privileges.

The Chicago delegation to the IATSE convention in Louisville in 1934 included Tony Accardo, recently indicted because of illegal visits to his chief, Ricca, in Federal prison; Louis Romano, who was muscled into control of the Chicago bartenders' union, and "Hindu" Imburgio, whose brother, Joseph Imburgio Bulger, an attorney, figured in the trial of the four gangsters and the present investigation into their paroles.

CONTROLLED UNIONISTS

"We made Jerry Horan and Mike Carozzo heads of their unions and we can do it for you." Nitti told Browne. Horan was national head of the building service employes' union. Carozzo controlled many thousands of street and building laborers, mostly Italians.

It is of sordid record that the IATSE convention elected Browne as international president, and the record was supplied to the congressmen.

Browne obeyed Nitti and immediately named Bioff as Browne's "personal representative," with full power to act—call strikes, and settle them. Nick Circella was named Chicago representative.

One of Nitti's first orders to Browne was "never meet an exhibitor or producer or discuss business with anyone except when Nick Circella is present." That applied to Chicago. Bioff would act for the mob elsewhere.

ORGANIZE AND COLLECT

"Get organized and collect some dough," Nitti told Bioff.

Tommy Maloy, head of local No. 10, of the motion-picture operators' union in Chicago, was killed by a shotgun blast on Chicago's outer drive on February 4, 1935. Nitti ordered Circella to take over Maloy's union. The motion-picture operators' local, like Browne's stagehands' local No. 2, was a part of the IATSE of which Browne was president.

Circella started a drive to force the motion picture theater owners to put two men in a booth, meaning to force them to hire two operators where they needed only one. The Chicago theater owners paid $100,000 to stop that maneuver. Balaban and Katz paid $80,000 of it.

The late William Pacelli, former twentieth ward alderman, who was handling the affairs of the boys, was put on the pay roll of an organization representing the smaller theater owners.

LEVY ON THEATER MEN

Jack Barger, of the Rialto Theater, who had to pay the syndicate 50 percent of his profits for the privilege of doing business in the first ward, under Capone-Ricca-Guzik domination, was compelled to put Frank Maritote, alias Diamond, brother-in-law of Capone, on the theater pay roll for $200 a week and keep him there 5 years.

Phil D'Andrea, who had operated a bawdy house on the West Side with Jack Zuta, was put on the Balaban and Katz pay roll for $175 to $200 a week, and kept on the pay roll for at least 5 years. His brother and sister also were put on theater pay rolls.

Chicago exhibitors were paying the Nitti gang. The extortion plan was working.

Meanwhile, Bioff was shaking down Hollywood. He started out by getting $100,000 from Joe Schenck in some kind of a funny deal. Bioff called a few strikes to show his power, and the money rolled in.

"We told Nick Schenck to get $2,000,000 for us," Bioff explained later to a jury.

NITTI BOOSTS HIS TAKE

In the beginning, Browne and Bioff split 50–50 with Nitti, Ricca, and Campagna; but in 1935 Nitti demanded two-thirds of the loot, and Bioff told Browne it would have to be that way, because they couldn't operate without the Nation-wide power of the Nitti mafia organization behind them.

Louis Greenberg, Nitti's financial adviser, who recently testified before a congressional committee in Washington, sent a man named Frank Korte to be vice president of the union.

Izzy Zevin, a brother-in-law of Greenberg, was sent to the union to take charge of a levy of 2 percent on the wages of the 46,000 members of the international.

It was this action—robbing the workers—that later brought about a so-called mail-fraud indictment against the gangsters. It was this second indictment which Attorney General Tom Clark dismissed prior to their parole.

THE MONEY ROLLS IN

With money rolling in from both sides of the racket—from the union members and from their employers—the gangsters began buying farms and estates. Bioff had a $330,000 home in Hollywood. Ricca bought a plantation in the South and a farm in Illinois. Campagna bought farms in Indiana and Michigan.

In Chicago, Nitti, pleased with his new technique, was taking over other unions. There was a mention in the record of his plan to make George McLane, boss of the Chicago bartenders' union, head of the International Union of Bartenders, Waiters, and Miscellaneous Hotel and Restaurant Employees. McLane, however, was eventually thrown to the wolves, and Louis Romano, one of the delegates who helped elect Browne, was put in charge of the local union by Nitti.

Nitti had plans for an extortion empire he was organizing with these purposes in view:

1. To control the country's drinking.
2. To control the country's entertainment.
3. To control the country's gambling.

ROPE IN PERFORMERS

Nitti ordered Bioff to take charge of the American Guild of Variety Artists, called Agva for short, and it was planned to make Charles (Cherry Nose) Gioe, one of the now notorious four parolees, its boss. All important night club and vaudeville performers in the country had to belong to Agva.

An exposé of his unsavory past in 1939 resulted in Bioff being extradited from California to Chicago to serve a 6-month jail sentence for pandering. Bioff went to the Bridewell on April 15, 1940.

While there, Bioff demanded that the Nitti gang use its political power to get him out. Gioe, whose later conviction was due mainly to Bioff's testimony, was sent to the jail to tell Bioff that the $25,000 fee the gang wanted to pay James Slattery, then United States Senator, to seek a pardon for Bioff, had been spurned. State's Attorney Courtney said the mob then offered $50,000 for a pardon for Bioff.

In Washington, Jacob M. Arvey, Cook County Democratic boss, testified that Bioff sought to retain Arvey as his attorney. Arvey said he refused to act for Bioff.

BIOFF GETS REVENGE

In jail, Bioff had demanded and obtained every possible privilege, but was demanding more. Gioe was sent to tell Bioff to behave himself. Gioe later told associates he found it necessary on that occasion to hit Bioff, and to call him a panderer. Bioff got revenge later by his testimony in the extortion case against Gioe and the other gangsters.

Out in California, Bioff's activities were coming into the spotlight. He was indicted on an income tax fraud charge. His deals with the movie magnates, which caused many false bookkeeping entries, resulted in the indictment of Joe Schenck, chairman of the board of Twentieth Century Fox. Eventually Schenck was convicted and sentenced to 3 years in prison, partly as the result, Bioff admitted later, of Bioff's perjured testimony.

On his own income tax case in California, Bioff obtained a delay by representing that his services were necessary to the motion-picture industry's war effort. He had resigned from the IATSE when his pandering past was flashed on the screens of the world, but after getting out of jail, he was welcomed back into the union at one of its conventions.

INDICTED FOR EXTORTION

The Government had learned how much money Bioff and Browne had taken out of the industry. In 1941, they were indicted in New York. The charges were that they had used their union positions to extort $550,000 from four of the country's leading motion-picture companies—Twentieth Century-Fox, Loew's Inc., Paramount Pictures, and Warner Bros.

The indictments were voted in New York because Browne maintained his principal office there. Circella, of course, represented him in Chicago, and Bioff represented him in Hollywood. Circella was indicted at the same time and eventually pleaded guilty. John P. (Big) Nick, of St. Louis, who was Browne's first vice president of the union, also was indicted and convicted.

On November 12, 1941, Bioff was sentenced to 20 years with a stipulation by Judge John Knox that it would be 10 years if he paid a $20,000 fine. Browne's sentence was for 8 years. Judge Knox retained jurisdiction, however, at the request of Prosecutor Boris Kostelanetz, who was investigating the connection of the Capone gang, under Nitti, Ricca, and Campagna, with the extortion scheme.

BROWNE AND BIOFF SQUEAL

Kostelanetz believed someone might be willing to trade testimony for time. He was right. Browne and Bioff were willing, after they had spent a year in prison. They squealed on their gangster mentors.

As a result, nine gangsters were indicted, including Nitti and six others from Chicago, charged with extorting more than $1,000,000 from movie producers, and with stealing another $1,000,000 or more from union members.

The other Chicagoans indicted were Louis Campagna, Paul Ricca, Frank Maritote, Philip D'Andrea, Ralph Pierce, and Charles Gioe.

The first indictment said the $1,000,000 from the movie industry was exacted for "protection," that is, to prevent and dissuade the defendants and their confederates from injuring or attempting to injure the business of the victims, by the use or misuse of the power which the defendants had over labor unions.

NITTI COMMITS SUICIDE

Circella, who pleaded guilty, later was denied a parole. He did not testify against Ricca and the others before the grand jury which indicted them, although he was listed as a possible prosecution witness in the trial.

On the day the indictment was returned, March 19, 1943, Nitti committed suicide in North Riverside, less than a mile from his home. It was reported he feared he would be convicted. He knew his financial manager, Louis Greenberg, had testified against him before the New York grand jury, and that Browne and Bioff had squealed, and that there was a possibility that Circella might be a witness against him.

The others were taken to New York for a trial which began October 6, 1943, before Judge John Bright of the United States District Court. Bioff, the first witness, told of a time when, he said, he wanted to get out of the business of extorting money from businessmen. He said he told Nitti, Ricca, and Campagna he was going to resign.

RESIGNATION MEANT DEATH

"Anybody who resigns from us resigns feet first," he quoted Campagna as telling him.

The gangsters did not testify in their own defense. The Government had traced payments of $1,800,000 in cash to the extortioners, and on the basis of the testimony relative to a split of two-thirds for the Nitti mob, and one-third to be divided by Browne and Bioff, the Government alleged that $1,200,000 was turned over to the Chicago syndicate.

On December 22, 1943, a jury of nine women and three men found seven defendants guilty. Ralph Pierce, one of the indicted Chicago gangsters, had been freed by a directed verdict. Those convicted were Ricca, Campagna, Gioe, D'Andrea, Maritote, and the lesser lights. These were John Roselli, of Hollywood, former west coast organizer and agent for the gang, and Louis Kaufman, of Newark, N. J., former business agent for the IATSE local in Newark. All were permitted to remain at liberty on bail until December 30, 1943.

SEEK LIGHT SENTENCES

On that day Judge Bright gave consideration to pleas for light sentences.

"There is no hope for parole for these men, so please consider that in fixing sentence," James Murray, defense attorney, told the court.

A. Bradley Eben, another defense attorney, said: "There isn't one chance in a thousand that a parole board would ever give these men consideration because of their past records."

"I agreed with that statement—that there seemed to be not one chance in a thousand that the men ever would be paroled," Prosecutor Kostelanetz recently testified before a congressional committee investigating the paroles.

Judge Bright decided that six of the men should serve the maximum terms, 10 years, and pay fines of $10,000. The seventh defendant, Kaufman, received a sentence of 7 years.

GET PRISON TRANSFER

"The evidence showed the guilt of these men was practically without dispute," said Judge Bright. "Except for Kaufman, not one of them was a member of the union, or had any right to interfere with the activities of the union."

On April 4, 1944, they were received in the Federal penitentiary in Atlanta, Ga., having been held until then in detention cells in New York City.

But they didn't stay there. Even before they entered prison, wheels began turning in an effort to get them out.

The first evidence of this came when the gangsters were transferred from the penitentiary at Atlanta to the penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., "so they would be nearer home." This was done at the request of Paul Dillon, a St. Louis attorney and former campaign manager for President Truman.

Dillon explained later that he acted at the request of the late Edward (Putty Nose) Brady, former Missouri legislator and saloon owner.

BRADY'S HELP SOUGHT

Dillon said Brady, in turn, had been requested to enlist his aid in behalf of the imprisoned gangsters by the wife of Louis Campagna, with whom Brady had long been acquainted.

By coincidence, Dillon had been attorney for Nick, vice president of Browne and Bioff's IATSE, when Nick was indicted for extorting $10,000 from movie-theater owners.

In any event, as soon as Dillon asked for the transfer of the four convicts, they were transferred, although a memorandum signed by the Atlanta prison warden, which later was placed in the files of a congressional investigating committee, said "it is evident money was paid for the transfer."

As time went on, the Tribune, which daily sifts hundreds of reports and rumors, began to hear of strange goings-on in five wards where the voters are predominantly Italian. A county election was approaching. Republican leaders in these five wards were influenced, through Italian organizations and otherwise, by the leaders of the Capone syndicate. The reports, as repeated, were that the Republican leaders had been ordered to deliver all the votes they could to the Democrats, "to help out the boys."

SLOT MACHINES POP OUT

About the same time, slot machines began to appear in the country towns, which were in the jurisdiction of Michael Mulcahey, Democratic sheriff. Tavern owners told Tribune reporters that they got the machines whether they wanted them or not.

The wheels were turning. In order to get out of prison, Ricca and his fellow convicts knew they had to clear two hurdles. One was the settlement of the Government's claim against them for unpaid income taxes running into hundreds of thousands of dollars. The other was to obtain the dismissal of the indictment still pending, which charged the gangsters with extorting a million dollars or more from members of the IATSE.

In connection with his income-tax problems, two men called on Paul Ricca at Leavenworth penitentiary. One was Attorney Bernstein, a political figure in Arvey's twenty-fourth ward. The other man signed the prison register as Joseph Imburgio Bulger, a Chicago attorney. But he wasn't Bulger. He was Tony Accardo, or Joe Batters, who was running the syndicate's affairs while the syndicate heads were in prison. Both Bernstein and Accardo were subsequently indicted by a Chicago Federal grand jury.

BANK NOTES RAIN DOWN

It was after this visit, Attorney Bernstein subsequently told a congressional investigating committee, that fat bundles of bank notes began to rain on his desk, dropped there by men who said, "This is for Paul."

Bernstein told the committee he didn't ask questions. By means of a deal with the Internal Revenue Bureau, tax claims against the four gangsters totaling $670,000 were settled for $128,000. The bundles of money so mysteriously dropped on Bernstein's desk were applied toward the payment of this tax settlement, Bernstein said.

The wheels were still turning. But there remained the mail-fraud indictment, which, if it continued to stand, would serve as an automatic bar to the parole of the four gangsters at the end of 3 years and 4 months, representing one-third of their sentences, which they had to serve before becoming eligible for parole.

CALLS ON TOM CLARK

One day a lawyer named Maury Hughes from Dallas, Tex., dropped in for a chat with a couple of assistants to his great and good friend, Attorney General Tom Clark, another Texan. Hughes is a former Texas Democratic State chairman. He was on the Texas delegation which supported President Truman for the Vice Presidential nomination in the convention which nominated the late President Roosevelt for a fourth term.

Hughes, although he has no office in Chicago, also has represented another member of the Capone syndicate—Mike (the Greek) Potson, former owner of Colosimo's restaurant, recently convicted here of income-tax evasion.

After Hughes had his chat with the Attorney General's assistants, a special assistant to Clark appeared in Federal District Court in New York and asked for the dismissal of the mail fraud indictment against the four gangsters. The court asked several sharp questions, but there was no getting around the fact that the Justice Department wanted the indictment dismissed. The court ordered it dismissed.

ADMITS $15,000 FEE

Maury Hughes did not appear as an attorney of record. Nevertheless, he testified later before a congressional committee that for his chat with three of Mr. Clark's assistants he received a fee of $15,000, paid to him he said, by a mysterious Mike Ryan, who looked, Hughes recalled, like an Italian. He said he never has seen Mike Ryan again and wouldn't know where to find him.

The Chicago election was out of the way by this time, and the five Italian wards had cast unprecedently large Democratic votes.

Chairman Arvey of the county Democratic organization admitted to the investigating committee that the Republican leaders in the five wards did help the Democrats that time, but he denied there was any deal.

"It is true that the five Italian Republican ward leaders sat the election out, but they did so because they were sore at Governor Green for a slight to some of their legislators," Arvey told the committee. "It is true the Democrats got more votes in those wards at that election than ever before or since."

ARVEY RATHER EVASIVE

On the subject of slot machines, Arvey said he had no information. He admitted, however, that he had heard about the indictment of several persons for operating slot machines at or about the time the taxes for the imprisoned gangsters were squared, and at or about the time the five Italian Republican ward leaders delivered Democratic votes.

"If Scotty Krier, Democratic committeeman out in the Skokie district, said he got an O. K. from downtown to allow slot machines to run, to whom did the term 'downtown' refer?" Arvey was asked.

"Maybe he meant the Tribune," Arvey replied. "It is downtown. I don't know. You'd have to ask him who he meant."

Representative BUSBEY, Republican, of Illinois, a member of the committee, said the Arvey testimony was important in view of the story that Chicago Republicans in certain wards were herded into polling places to vote Democratic "so four guys can get out on parole."

VOTE FRAUDS CHARGED

Arvey at first disowned Bernstein as a member of his Twenty-fourth Ward Democratic Club, but later admitted he had been mistaken. Arvey testified that Bernstein had not been a Twenty-fourth Ward Democratic club member since 1931. It was shown that Bernstein was twice indicted on vote fraud charges in 1939 because of his activities as a precinct captain in the Arvey organization.

The wheels are still turning, and they have nearly completed their revolution. On August 6, 1947, Attorney Dillon dropped in to see his old friend, T. Webber Wilson, chairman of the Federal parole board, in Washington.

Seven days later, almost on the very day they became eligible for parole, the four gangsters walked out of prison.

Some of the circumstances of their release were extraordinary, to say the least.

RED TAPE QUICKLY CUT

For one thing, the day before the gangsters were released, the parole office in Chicago received a telephone call from the prison at Leavenworth requesting that certain matters of red tape, such as interviewing sponsors for the parolees, be expedited. They were—and how. Within a matter of hours, investigations which ordinarily require days, or even weeks, were announced as completed, and the result was transmitted to Leavenworth, clearing the way for the gangsters' release on schedule.

On August 13, 1947, the prison doors swung open for them. The next day they were in Chicago. A storm of protest followed. Police Commissioner Prendergast said the gangsters should have been barred from Chicago forever. The Chicago crime commission said the paroles were an outrage and a national disgrace.

The Tribune, digging into the then undisclosed circumstances surrounding the

paroles, encountered a singular wall of official reticence.

It was learned that Chairman Wilson of the parole board had resigned, effective August 31, and had gone to his home in Coldwater, Miss., where he subsequently died.

PAID DEBT TO SOCIETY

The two other members of the board, Fred S. Rogers and B. K. Monkiewicz, said they had never heard of the Capone gang, and were of the opinion that these middle-aged criminals could be rehabilitated and they wanted to give them another chance.

The fact that Campagna had served a previous term for robbery was shrugged off. "He paid his debt to society," said Rogers, a former member of the Texas State parole board.

The fact that D'Andrea had been arrested during the trial of Al Capone in the courtroom of Judge James Wilkerson in Chicago in 1931, with a loaded pistol in his pocket, was mentioned. It made little impression.

At his Mississippi home, Chairman Wilson said he was familiar with conditions in Chicago. He had made political speeches here, he said.

STORY CALLED CHILDISH

Wilson said he knew something about the Capone gang but didn't believe all he read. It was his opinion, he said, that Browne and Bioff, who had been released by court order after serving 3 years, in return for their testimony in the extortion trial, were the real offenders.

Representative BUSBEY characterized Wilson's explanations as childish.

"There are nasty rumors in Chicago that somebody got a lot of money to let these desperate gangsters out of prison," BUSBEY wired J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Representative BUSBEY subsequently pointed out the sharp contrast between the ease and precision with which paroles fell into the laps of the four Capone hoodlums, at the earliest moment it was possible for them to be released, and the parole experience of William R. (Big Bill) Johnson, former Chicago gambler, now serving a 5-year term in the Federal prison, at Terre Haute, Ind., for income-tax evasion.

RAPS EASY SETTLEMENT

"Johnson's only crime was income-tax evasion," BUSBEY commented. "He was convicted October 12, 1940, and became eligible for parole in November last year, after completing 20 months of his sentence. Johnson also applied for a parole, but apparently he neglected to retain Paul Dillon or Maury Hughes as counsel. On April 1 of this year the parole board denied Johnson's application.

"The four gangsters who were sentenced for the much graver offense of extortion, also were guilty of income-tax evasion. Yet, as a prelude to their paroles, they were permitted to settle the Government's income-tax claims against them at less than 20 cents on the dollar, despite the fact that they are wealthy men, and have property on which the Government could have levied.

"Paul Ricca, who testified before the committee that he had an income of from $50,000 to $100,000 a year, owns a 1,100-acre farm in Kendall County. Campagna owns a 750-acre farm in Indiana, and rents 150 acres in partnership with another man."

WASHINGTON RETICENT

In New York, Judge Bright said he had opposed the Ricca gang paroles, and so had Prosecutor Kostelanetz. But in Washington, there was no disposition on the part of any official to make public the facts concerning the release of the gangsters.

Board members Monkiewicz and Rogers suggested that possibly Judge Bright had forgotten a letter he wrote them. They intimated the judge had consented to the release. Judge Bright's letter was obtained. Its conclusion was:

"The activities of these defendants not only were directed against the motion picture industry but also against the unions and union members. I know of no better way to suppress this kind of activity than by severe punishment."

The House antiracketeering subcommittee, headed by Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, Republican, Michigan, opened hearings into the granting of the paroles, in Chicago, on September 25, 1947.

TRUMAN FRIEND EXPLAINS

Without being summoned, Attorney Dillon stormed before the committee and asked to be heard.

"Yes, I managed two of President Truman's senatorial campaigns in St. Louis," said Dillon, "but that had nothing to do with the fact that I appeared for these four men before the parole board last August. I did that as a favor to Mrs. Campagna, who was the friend of my friend, Edward Brady, member of the Missouri Legislature. I didn't get paid, either."

After that hearing, Dillon sent a bill for $10,000 to Campagna, and it was paid, he testified in a later appearance before the committee in Washington.

"What about your activities in behalf of those Chicago convicts in getting them transferred from Atlanta to Leavenworth?" asked Chairman HOFFMAN.

BUSBEY BLAMES CLARK

"I didn't get paid for that, either," replied Dillon.

Representative BUSBEY said he pinned on Attorney General Clark the personal responsibility for dismissal of the mail fraud indictment against the gangsters.

Clark, when he appeared before the committee, assumed responsibility for refusing the committee's request for a report prepared by the FBI after its agents questioned more than 200 persons about the paroles granted the Capone hoodlums.

Clark had directed the FBI to conduct an investigation after the congressional inquiry was launched, but suppressed its report. He told the committee that he found in the report no evidence of corruption. One of the strange things about the FBI investigation was that FBI agents questioned Maury Hughes, whose connection with the paroles had not been disclosed at that time, about a conversation Hughes said he had overheard in a night club about a conference of Republican leaders in Berrien Springs, Mich., for the purpose of plotting a "smear" in connection with the granting of the paroles.

TWO CLARK APPOINTEES

"In the beginning, Clark told us he had no power over the Parole Board," Busbey said in a statement. "He said it was an autonomous body, which could and did act without consulting or answering to him. But it was established that no one on the Parole Board would talk to the press without special permission from the Attorney General.

"Then it was shown that Clark had actually appointed two of the three parole board members who freed the Ricca gang, and that he does have the power to fire them without rhyme or reason. It was shown that he appointed his neighbor from Texas, Fred Rogers, in January 1947, and Monkiewicz in June 1947, when the parole applications of the Chicagoans were coming up for consideration.

"It was shown that Clark knew about the other New York indictment that would have been a bar to parole. It was shown that Clark was head of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice back in 1943 when the case was prosecuted, which gave him the duty of supervising the prosecution."

OFFICES IN SAME BUILDING

"Maury Hughes testified he has known Clark since Clark was 10 years old, and that he and Clark have offices in the same building in Dallas.

"Hughes said he didn't consult his old friend, Clark, about having the mail-fraud indictment dismissed. He consulted three of Clark's most confidential aids.

"Hughes said he talked with James McGranery, who had the title of Assistant Attorney General; with Douglas McGregor, who succeeded McGranery in that position, and with Peyton Ford, who now holds that job. McGranery was appointed a Federal judge in Philadelphia some time after he talked with Hughes. McGregor resigned last October after the congressional investigations started and returned to his Texas law practice."

NOT ON COURT RECORD

"The name of Hughes does not appear on any court record in connection with the dismissal of the indictment which charged the gangsters with stealing 2 percent of the wages of the 46,000 union members. The dismissal was obtained before a different judge than the one who heard the other case, and apparently it was done on motion of the Government—not of any defense counsel.

"Hughes said he was told by the man who hired him that Ricca wanted the mail fraud indictment out of the way so he could get a parole. When that action was accomplished, on May 6, 1947, the way was cleared for the parole. Hughes acknowledges receipt of a fee of $15,000."

Attorney General Clark told the committee that the dismissal of the mail fraud indictment was routine, and that it had been recommended by Kostelanetz.

Kostelanetz, called before the committee, testified that he had only recommended that the mail fraud indictment be kept alive for "at least 2 years after the date of the denial of an appeal of the men for a new trial."

"HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT"

Theodore Rein, an attorney who appeared before the congressional committee in behalf of Ricca and challenged the committee's jurisdiction, denied that his law partnership of many years with Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH was responsible for his being hired to represent Ricca.

Representative BUSBEY asserted, however, that the fact that Rein, a partner of Sabath, Attorney A. Bradley Eben, whose mother is employed in the White House, and Congressman Vito Marcantonio, who was considered as being close to the late President Roosevelt, were employed by the Chicago gangsters, along with Maury Hughes, close friend of Attorney General Clark, and Paul Dillon, intimate friend of President Truman, was highly significant.

Dillon's relationship with the Chicago gang was again mentioned by Willie Heeney, veteran Capone gangster, who came here from St. Louis. Heeney, who was a partner of Campagna in two prosperous Cicero gambling houses, said Dillon frequently visited him at his El Patio Club in Cicero, and he frequently visited Dillon in St. Louis.

DENY FINANCING PAROLES

Dillon, Francis Curry, Joliet gambler, and Louis Greenberg all denied financing the paroles of the four gangsters. Heeney, an aging semi-invalid, just pleaded ignorance.

Curry, vigorous, in his early forties, gave sharp answers to the Congressmen who had directed a hunt for him that was carried on for more than a month before he was subpenaed. He admitted having gambling concessions in Will County and Joliet, but refused details of his income.

However, Theodore Link, a St. Louis newspaperman, tied Curry to the gambling operations of the Capone gang in Chicago, Joliet, St. Louis, and down to Dallas, Tex.

PAROLE SYSTEM HARMED

Rogers, on the witness stand, refused to admit the paroles were "an error." He said the resultant investigation had done great harm to the parole system.

Monkiewicz accepted a full share of the responsibility for freeing the gangsters. Then, under questioning by Chairman HOFFMAN, he disclosed that the convicts were at large for 2 days before he knew it.

He said he was appointed to the board on June 5 and was sent out to visit prisons. He returned to Washington August 15, he said, "and these cases were on the top of my agenda."

"But the men were out of prison 2 days then," said HOFFMAN. "Apparently two members could order a release, so what did they need of you?"

FAILED TO DISSENT

"Well, I could have dissented," said Monkiewicz. "But I didn't. I studied the files for half an hour and then signed the release order, making it unanimous."

Wilson died before the committee could question him. Judge Bright also died during the investigation. A half dozen or more employees of the Internal Revenue Bureau have refused to give the committee information on the details of the settlement of the income-tax claims against the paroled gangsters.

The investigation is continuing.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I was particularly interested in the comment of the gentleman from Illinois in connection with the article that appeared in the Chicago Tribune by Mr. James Doherty. I have had the pleasure of serving with my chairman on a committee investigating paroles. It occurred to me as particularly significant that that article should have appeared this morning, for while apparently Mr. Doherty stayed out of the Tribune during the period that the paroles were under active consideration by the committee, there was some evidence to indicate he was using the investigation purely as a medium of publicity for the Chicago Tribune.

It seems rather significant to me that this should have appeared in a paper which reached here today. It seems rather significant that the gentleman from Illinois should have injected it at this point. I realize that Chicago has had a wave of gangsterism in the past. That is unfortunate. Perhaps it is unfortunate, too, that those parolees were paroled. It may be that the Department of Justice could have provided the committee with more information than it did.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I am delighted to yield to my chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman think that if that matter were left to the committee, of which he is a member, that you would be able to handle it?

Mr. HARDY. Distinctly so, and if Mr. Doherty would stay out of the Chicago Tribune where he has been getting so much publicity, we would get along better. I thank you.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY to the Herter amendment: After the period following "court" add the following:

"This section shall be retroactive to recover any such papers, documents, or records that have been taken in violation of this section."

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. It is clearly unconstitutional to make certain penalties retroactive and the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that the House does not pass on questions of constitutionality and overrules the point of order.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in accord with the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. The only thing his amendment does not do is to make the recovery of papers retroactive. There have been many, many very important papers taken by officials of the Government which did not belong to them and certainly could never be considered as personal in any way, shape, or form. Those papers and documents were the property of the Government. Unless my amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is adopted I do not believe that we will ever have an opportunity to recover these papers which belong to the Government and which certainly should be placed in the National Archives. I hope the House will seriously consider my amendment for the benefit of posterity.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] contains a penalty clause. While I find myself in general agreement with the thought and purpose of the amendment to the amendment as submitted by the gentleman from Illinois, I would like to see many of the papers that have been taken out of Government offices returned to Government offices. The adoption of this amendment to the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Illinois would, of course, be retroactive and would be ex post facto legislation and unconstitutional—there is no question about it. Therefore, it could not be enforced but would destroy the effect of the Herter amendment. Therefore, I sincerely hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman from Ohio is certainly in accord with the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Absolutely, but I hope the gentleman will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. As long as the gentleman is in accord with the purpose of the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution proceeds on the basis of a number of gross misconceptions.

It proceeds on the assumption that the majority of any congressional committee, plus either the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House, is in a better position than the President of the United States to know and determine what information, available to him in and for the carrying out of his duties, the public interest requires shall be maintained on a confidential basis. Merely to state this proposition is to demonstrate its incorrectness. It would be most presumptuous for a congressional committee which seeks information about a particular matter that it may be investigating, to set its judgment up against that of the President as to the importance of keeping confidential the information sought. No congressional committee can presume to know as well as the President whether it is in the public interest that a given piece of information in the executive branch be kept confidential. Only the President is in a position fully to know what matters in addition to the particular information itself must be considered in arriving at this judgment. A committee whose knowledge must perforce be confined to one particular aspect of Government activity cannot possibly know this. No more, for that matter, can the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House.

The resolution has been amended, since first introduced, by the insertion of the words "created by the Congress," in line 4, so as to be applicable to information only in those departments and agencies of the Government created by the Congress. The assumption appears to be that since the Congress has authority to create the executive departments and has exercised that authority, it therefore has the right to tell those departments how they shall do their business and what information obtained by them in the course of their business they shall turn over to the Congress. This assumption is wrong. If it were true, all the business of the executive branch of the Government, except that performed by the President in person, would be performed under congressional direction and supervision. Except for the President himself, the entire executive branch has been created by the Congress, and the funds for its operation as well as the funds for the payment of the President's salary and expenses are appropriated by the Congress. It is rather naive, as well as late in the day, to assume that from this congressional authority stems the power to run the executive branch. All the precedents—judicial, congressional, and executive—are to the contrary.

Something new has been added to the resolution. Further amendments provide that it shall be a crime, punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, for any individual to divulge information,

knowledge of which he obtained by reason of the disclosure of such information to a congressional committee pursuant to House Joint Resolution 342. Such divulging of information will, however, be a crime only in those instances where a majority of the committee has declared the information divulged to be confidential. The basic assumption of this new provision is likewise incorrect, as has been demonstrated above. It would be most presumptuous for a congressional committee with one piece of information before it, which it has obtained by virtue of this resolution, to pass judgment upon whether the public interest requires that information, or some part thereof, to be held confidential. The information in the hands of the committee may on its face and to the unsuspecting appear completely innocuous. The President, the Secretary of Defense, or some other officer in the executive branch might, on the other hand, have good reason to know that public disclosure of the apparently innocuous information, because of its relationship to other pieces of information, is contrary to the public interest or to the national security. Intelligence officers, those of foreign powers as well as ours, know full well the value of picking up and fitting together a number of pieces of information, each by itself apparently innocuous.

The President is charged with the defense of the United States, both in terms of internal and external security. Under the President, the Congress has specifically provided that various aspects of that defense are to be maintained by specified officers and agencies in the executive branch, for example, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and others. To say, as the resolution does, that these officers and agencies, and others of like national importance, are to be required, at the request of any committee of the Congress, to disclose information to that committee, despite the fact that the particular officer knows that such a disclosure will impair the national security, is to say that these officers and agencies can no longer be responsible for that security. Responsibility for the national security must carry with it the authority, the unquestioned authority, to decide what information may and what may not be disclosed. No committee of the Congress has, nor does the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House have, this responsibility; no committee of the Congress nor the President of the Senate nor the Speaker of the House should have this authority.

The tendency exhibited by this resolution is an alarming one from the standpoint of the Congress itself. The Congress values highly and guards carefully its rights to be free of inquiry by the courts. The Congress would resent, and justifiably, any attempt to pry into the activities of, say, one of its committees in executive session. The Congress has no more business prying into the confidential business of the executive branch.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on all amendments close in 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this resolution.

It was my intention to have offered an amendment to the committee amendment which is section 2 of this resolution—House Joint Resolution 342—to throw some safeguard around persons not members of committees or employees thereof, who might come into possession of information found to be confidenitial by a majority of the committee without knowing that such information had been found confidential, but the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] obviated the necessity of my amendment and I therefore did not offer it.

Realizing the extreme importance of this resolution I listened carefully to the entire debate.

I was much impressed by the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] against the resolution, but I was more impressed by the clarity, logic, and courage of the splendid presentation in favor of the resolution by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

I am not one who will vote for anything regardless of my belief of its unconstitutionality and thus "pass the buck" to the Supreme Court, nor am I one to vote against something because I have some slight doubt as to its constitutionality, particularly where the objective to be accomplished appears to be a good one.

There is much to be said on both sides of the present question. On the one hand there is absolute necessity for the maintenance of the independence of each of the three branches of our Government. Any ill-advised attempt by one branch to encroach upon the proper function of another branch should be defeated. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, how can the legislative branch of this Government function when the enormous bureaucracy which has been created under the general jurisdiction of the executive department arbitrarily refuses to furnish the legislative branch with information absolutely essential to the intelligent formulation and passage of legislation?

In the short time I have been a Member of this House, I have suffered, along with the other Members, in determining how to vote, from lack of complete information upon subjects because somebody in the executive department just did not want to give it to the Congress. It seems to me utter folly for the people to elect Representatives to the Congress, giving them the responsibility of the passage of legislation, and then entertain the expectation that they can intelligently perform their functions without the facts necessary to do so.

It is rather surprising, and at the same time amusing, to hear some Members express awful fear that the legislative branch of this Government will improperly dominate the executive branch when those same Members no doubt sat during the long term of the practical dominance of the Congress by the Executive beginning shortly after 1933. Although I was not in the House during most of this period, it is certainly a matter of common knowledge that legislation was prepared by the Executive, brought on the floor of this Congress, and passed without change and without question by many Members, under some kind of theory that the Executive knew better what legislation the country needed than did the Members of the House and Senate, whose duty and function it was to themselves prepare and pass upon legislation.

We certainly do not want dominance by any branch of this Government, but there is far less danger of an effective dominance by 435 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate than from 1 man in the White House. While, as Jefferson intimated, 531 tyrants are no better than 1 tyrant, nevertheless it ought to be plain from history that 1 tyrant is more efficient in tyranny than a deliberative body of 531.

Recently I had occasion to examine into decisions of the Supreme Court—most of them prior to the appointment of the present personnel of that Court—on the subject of the investigatory powers of Congress, and those decisions convinced me that the Supreme Court has not only recognized the existence of those powers and sanctioned the proper procedure for calling witnesses before it, but has, at the same time, passed upon the limitations of the powers, including the type of questions witnesses were required to answer.

It appears from the remarks of both the proponents and opponents of the present resolution that the calling and questioning as witnesses of officials and employees of the executive department by the legislative department of the Government has not been directly decided by the Supreme Court. Not only do I believe that these questions should be passed upon by that Court, and that the passage of the resolution is about the only way we can get decisions in point, but it is also my belief that within reasonable limitations which will not interfere with or encroach upon the constitutional duties of the Executive, this Congress ought to be held to have the power to obtain from executive officials and employees information proper and necessary for its legislative functions just the same as it can now obtain that information from private individuals. In fact, it would seem that it is more important for the Congress to obtain such information from such officials and employees than from private individuals.

In conclusion, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that this Congress does not have the power through its investigatory function or otherwise to disturb, interfere with, hamper, or embarrass the Executive in the proper performance of the duties which the Constitution prescribes for him, yet at the same time, that that Executive should never be in a position to arbitrarily prevent this Congress from obtaining information necessary for its legislative function through the Executive's sole judgment or desire about what information

that Congress should have. Consequently, the only way, as so courageously pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], to determine this matter is by the passage of the resolution before us which, I believe, properly guards against the danger of divulgence of information which, if made public, would jeopardize the safety of our country. Therefore, I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 8, line 21, at the end of the section add a new section 3, as follows:

" 'SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any provision of this resolution, if the President or the Secretary of an executive department so requests in writing, information, books, records, or memoranda submitted to any committee of the Congress hereunder shall be deemed confidential;' and renumber the succeeding sections appropriately."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order because in effect it strikes out the enacting clause, which is a preferential motion and should be presented in writing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule that the amendment is germane. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in an effort to bring a little reason and balance into this entire controversy. Half of the problem is dealt with by giving a majority of the committee, under this resolution, the right to determine when particular information is confidential, and if it is, establishing severe penalties for divulging it publicly. My amendment assumes that the executive department is a responsible agency of Government, the President having been elected by the people—and I think my colleagues on my side of the aisle will agree that the next President is likely to be of another political party, of that of the majority in the Congress, yet if we pass this resolution he, too, will have the same problem, and so will his Secretaries who serve in the Cabinet under him.

This amendment which I propose provides that the President and the Secretaries shall have coequal right with the Congress to stamp a particular item of information "Confidential," and then the protection of this particular resolution shall extend as well to that information.

The important point in what I am trying to effect by my amendment by way of compromise between the widely divergent points of view here expressed, is this: A committee of Congress which wants information gets it, but the executive department has a right to say, "We also, being the representatives of the people, have a right to say that this information is considered confidential. Therefore, we give it to you because you are entitled to have it, but you must keep it confidential."

I know the argument will be made that that will be putting the executive department in the position of saying that anything it turns over to Congress can be marked "Confidential." But the men in the executive department are adults and will do their job according to their oath of office. As a matter of illustration, in the Foreign Affairs Committee we had some information handed to us which we considered very important, which the State Department marked "Confidential." We did not think it ought to be confidential. We thought the public ought to have it. Therefore, we sent it back and said, "We are sorry. If you insist on marking this 'Confidential,' we will not accept it." Our democratic purposes being what they are, the State Department promptly released the information and sent it to us as unclassified.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, there is nothing that would prevent the Congress from receiving this information, even though it is stamped "Confidential."

Mr. JAVITS. Not at all. The point is, the committee gets what it is after. It gets the information, but you give the executive department coequal right to protect those matters as confidential which it considers the public interest to require to be protected.

The committee and the executive department have a coequal right, under my amendment, but the Congress gets its information.

Mr. Chairman, I urge upon the committee that what my amendment proposes is a fair compromise.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this and all other amendments close in 5 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether the request of the gentleman includes any further amendments to the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the gentleman any amendment?

Mr. EBERHARTER. No; I do not have any amendment, but I would like to make some remarks on the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does any other Member have an amendment?

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in oposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again this is an amendment which I am sure has been offered in good faith and yet an amendment which destroys the effectiveness of this legislation; and if I may have the attention of the House for just about 5 minutes, I would like to read an order issued by one of the agencies of this Government setting forth what the word "Confidential" means. This is Circular No. 61 of July 29, 1947, issued by the Veterans' Administration. I quote:

Confidential information is information the unauthorized disclosure of which although not endangering the national security would be prejudicial to the interests or prestige of the Nation, any governmental activity or any individual or—

And I want you to get this, Mr. Chairman—

or would cause administrative embarrassment or difficulty.

That is the description and the definition of what "confidential papers" are by the Veterans' Administration; and it was the exposé of this particular order that won for Nat Finney the Pulitzer prize, because he did show it up and he forced that agency of the Government to withdraw it.

If this amendment as suggested by the gentleman from New York is adopted then anything in the world that any Department wants to call confidential must be kept confidential by the committee and the whole Congress cannot be given the information whether it creates embarrassment for the Department or not.

There is every protection in the world in this law for those things which are absolutely confidential. You have the honor and the integrity of the Speaker, you have the honor and the integrity of the committee system and of the majority of each and every legislative committee in the House which stands guard over any secret that might be dangerous if made public, and properly protecting the interest of the Government.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to continue for just 1 minute.

What this amendment does, of course, is to permit departments to decide for themselves whether they want the Congress as a whole or the public to learn anything about what is going on in their agency; and, under the law as it has been written here, it would be the committees and the Speaker of the House who would decide in the final analysis as to what should be done about this confidential information and certainly not the agency which might be under investigation. As I have just said, of course, here is a perfect example of it. We have had it in our own experience as to where some agency would mark something secret or confidential. I have heard members of the Appropriations and other great committees come to the floor of the House—and the Un-American Activities Committee—and say so. After all, it is up to the Congress to decide whether this information should be made available to every Member of the House.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that the gentleman's argument undertakes to differentiate between whether the information should be made public or kept confidential?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; the answer is a definite no.

Here is a paper that has been marked confidential, because, they say, it may embarrass a particular agency and should be held confidential. Now, none of that information could be made available under the gentleman's amendment except to the committee, but the committee would be barred from making it public to the rest of the Members of this House who might have to have it in

order to legislate properly. The effectiveness of the whole act is therefore destroyed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: Page 3, line 23, after the word "repealed" strike out the period and add "*Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall alter any provision of law which expressly protects from disclosure specified categories of information obtained by executive departments and agencies."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment rather in the nature of an exploratory operation. By section 3 we purport to repeal all laws inconsistent with existing law which, of course, is the result of this act anyway. It is not at all clear to me what will be repealed and I think it is equally clear that there are provisions of law which we do not want to repeal. I have in mind, for instance, the provisions of the statute governing the secrecy of atomic energy development information. Section 3 of this joint resolution would have the effect of repealing the protection now accorded against disclosure of atomic energy secrets.

There are other forms of information which the executive departments receive that are presently protected by express statutory provision. It may apply to information received by the Census Bureau, for instance, possibly some information received by the Securities and Exchange Commission as well as others. I do not know all of them, but now we propose to blindly repeal sections we do not know anything about and that we do not want to repeal perhaps.

I offer this general amendment to protect from repeal statutes that expressly provide for secrecy in particular cases and I hope the amendment will be accepted by the committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have not participated in the debate on this measure because important official proceedings elsewhere called for my attendance during most of the time when this measure was being considered by the House. However, I feel that I must express by views on it for the record. I am constrained to vote against the passage of this House joint resolution. I do not entertain much hope that it could be remedied by recommittal to the Committee, but I am opposed to it in its present form.

I listened with great interest to the logical and persuasive argument of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL] who offered an amendment that the provisions of this enactment should not extend to Cabinet officers. However, his amendment was voted down. I certainly feel that this legislation, even if it were thought necessary, is going too far when it applies to the members of the President's Cabinet.

The most fundamental feature of our constitutional Government is the tripartite division into the three equal and coordinate departments: namely, the legislative department, the executive department, and the judicial department, as provided for in the first three articles of the Constitution. While we have a system of checks and balances provided for in the Constitution, each department being somewhat limited by the control of it by the other two, I feel that that delicate balance established by the founding fathers would be seriously modified and thrown out of balance, or at least would tend to be thrown out of balance, by the enactment of the provision now before us. For that reason, I am constrained to vote against it.

After each war in recent American history, during which time the legislative department has necessarily been somewhat subordinated to the executive department, it seems there has been an inevitable reaction and the legislative department has retrieved some of the powers which it lost to the executive department during the period of the emergency. Perhaps that is as it should be that the fundamental balance might be restored. However, human nature being what it is, our past experience after each war has been that the legislative department not only quickly retrieved the delegated wartime powers which the executive department exercised during the emergency, but usually has gone further than merely to restore the balance.

The legislative department has sometimes in a vindictive spirit regained its prominence and powers and subordinated the executive department to a corresponding degree. I think I see the same thing happening now as it happened after the First World War, and as it happened after the Civil War. It is a question in my mind how much this conflict between the two great departments is for the good of the country, and how much of it will result in harm. To my mind, the passage of House Joint Resolution 342 would go too far and be harmful. There is no question in my mind but it contains dangerous possibilities which might even be probabilities.

It is not chiefly because I am a Democrat and of the same party as the present Executive administration, and that this enactment, if passed, will be passed by a Republican Congress, that I am in opposition. I do not hold a brief for all of the acts of the Democratic administration during the recent momentous years while I have been a Member of the Congress. I have no desire to shield any wrong-doing in the administrative departments during the recent war or since. I say let investigations be made and questionable acts be revealed to the public under present law. But I think existing law is ample without the enactment of this dangerous resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 342, directing all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to make available to any and all standing, special or select committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate information which may be deemed necessary to enable them to properly perform the duties delegated to them by the Congress, pursuant to House Resolution 575, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, being opposed to the resolution, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCORMACK moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 145, nays 217, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—145

Abbitt	Eberharter	King
Albert	Evins	Lanham
Allen, La.	Fallon	Larcade
Andrews, Ala.	Feighan	Lea
Bakewell	Fernandez	Lesinski
Barden	Flannagan	Lucas
Bates, Ky.	Fogarty	Ludlow
Beckworth	Folger	Lynch
Bland	Foote	McCormack
Blatnik	Forand	McMillan, S. C.
Bloom	Garmatz	Madden
Boggs, La.	Gary	Mahon
Bonner	Gordon	Manasco
Brooks	Gorski	Mansfield
Brown, Ga.	Gossett	Marcantonio
Bryson	Granger	Meade, Ky.
Buchanan	Grant, Ala.	Miller, Conn.
Buckley	Gregory	Mills
Burleson	Hardy	Monroney
Byrne, N. Y.	Harless, Ariz.	Morgan
Camp	Harrison	Morris
Cannon	Hart	Morton
Carroll	Havenner	Multer
Celler	Hays	Murdock
Chapman	Heffernan	Murray, Tenn.
Cheif	Hobbs	Norblad
Colmer	Holifield	Norton
Combs	Huber	O'Brien
Cooley	Isacson	O'Toole
Cooper	Jackson, Wash.	Pace
Courtney	Jenkins, Ohio	Passman
Crosser	Jones, Ala.	Patman
Deane	Jones, N. C.	Peden
Delaney	Karsten, Mo.	Philbin
Dingell	Kelley	Pickett
Domengeaux	Kennedy	Poage
Doughton	Keogh	Preston
Douglas	Kerr	Price, Fla.
Durham	Kilday	Price, Ill.

Priest
Rains
Rayburn
Redden
Regan
Richards
Riley
Rivers
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Smathers
Smith, Va.
Somers
Spence
Stanley
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Vinson
Walter
Wheeler
Whittington
Williams
Wilson, Tex.
Worley

NAYS—217

Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Auchincloss
Banta
Barrett
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bradley
Brehm
Brophy
Brown, Ohio
Buck
Buffett
Burke
Busbey
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chadwick
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clason
Coffin
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Corbett
Cotton
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Crow
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Devitt
Dolliver
Dondero
Eaton
Elliott
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fellows
Fenton
Fletcher
Fuller
Fulton
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillette
Gillie
Goff
Goodwin
Graham
Grant, Ind.
Gross
Gwinn, N. Y.
Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harness, Ind.
Harvey
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hull
Jackson, Calif.
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins, Pa.
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Jones, Wash.
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Keating
Keefe
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Knutson
Kunkel
Landis
Latham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lewis, Ohio
Lodge
Love
McConnell
McCowen
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McGarvey
McGregor
McMahon
McMillen, Ill.
Mack
MacKinnon
Macy
Maloney
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Mathews
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Muhlenberg
Mundt
Murray, Wis.
Nicholson
Nixon
Nodar
O'Hara
O'Konski
Owens
Patterson
Peterson
Phillips, Calif.
Potter
Potts
Poulson
Ramey
Rankin
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Rich
Riehlman
Rizley
Robertson
Rockwell
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Tibbott
Tollefson
Towe
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodruff
Youngblood

NOT VOTING—69

Abernethy
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Battle
Bell
Boykin
Bramblett
Bulwinkle
Butler
Clark
Clevenger
Clippinger
Coudert
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
D'Ewart
Dirksen
Donohue
Dorn
Engle, Calif.
Fisher
Gallagher
Gore
Griffiths
Harris
Hartley
Hébert
Hedrick
Hendricks
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Tex.
Kearney
Kearns
Kee
Kefauver
Kirwan
Klein
Lane
Lewis, Ky.
Lichtenwalter
Lusk
Lyle
Meade, Md.
Miller, Calif.
Mitchell
Morrison
Norrell
Pfeifer
Phillips, Tenn.
Ploeser
Plumley
Powell
St. George
Scoblick
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Ohio
Stigler
Stratton
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Trimble
Welch
West
Whitaker
Whitten
Winstead

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Ploeser against.
Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Welch against.
Mr. Gore for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.
Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Hartley against.
Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Kearns against.
Mr. Engle of California for, with Mr. Gallagher against.
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Lichtenwalter against.
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Anderson of California against.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. D'Ewart against.
Mr. Harris for, with Mr. Jennings against.
Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Plumley against.
Mr. Kee for, with Mr. Clippinger against.
Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Mitchell against.
Mr. Sikes for, with Mrs. St. George against.
Mr. Norrell for, with Mr. Scoblick against.
Mr. Hedrick for, with Mr. Stratton against.
Mr. Kefauver for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Kearney against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Butler with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Bramblett with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Phillips of Tennessee with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. Griffiths with Mr. Battle.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Bell.
Mr. H. Carl Andersen with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Lane.
Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 219, nays, 142, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—219

Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Auchincloss
Banta
Barrett
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bradley
Brehm
Brophy
Brown, Ohio
Buck
Buffett
Burke
Busbey
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chadwick
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clason
Coffin
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Corbett
Cotton
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Crow
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Devitt
Dolliver
Domengeaux
Dondero
Eaton
Elliott
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fellows
Fenton
Fletcher
Fuller
Fulton
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillette
Gillie
Goff
Goodwin
Graham
Grant, Ind.
Gross
Gwinn, N. Y.
Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harness, Ind.
Harvey
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hull
Jackson, Calif.
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins, Pa.
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Jones, Wash.
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Keating
Keefe
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Knutson
Kunkel
Landis
Latham
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lewis, Ky.
Lewis, Ohio
Lodge
Love
McConnell
McCowen
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McGarvey
McGregor
McMahon
McMillen, Ill.
Mack
MacKinnon
Macy
Maloney
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Mathews
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Muhlenberg
Mundt
Murray, Wis.
Nicholson
Nixon
Nodar
O'Hara
O'Konski
Owens
Patterson
Phillips, Calif.
Potter
Potts
Poulson
Ramey
Rankin
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Rich
Riehlman
Rizley
Robertson
Rockwell
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Tibbott
Tollefson
Towe
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodruff
Youngblood

NAYS—142

Abbitt
Albert
Allen, La.
Andrews, Ala.
Bakewell
Barden
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bland
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Bonner
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley
Burleson
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carroll
Celler
Chapman
Chelf
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Courtney
Crosser
Deane
Delaney
Dingell
Doughton
Douglas
Durham
Eberharter
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Foote
Forand
Garmatz
Gary
Gordon
Gorski
Gossett
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Gregory
Hardy
Harless, Ariz.
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hays
Heffernan
Hobbs
Holifield
Huber
Isacson
Jackson, Wash.
Jenkins, Ohio
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilday
King
Lanham
Larcade
Lesinski
Lucas
Ludlow
Lynch
McCormack
McMillan, S. C.
Madden
Mahon
Manasco
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Meade, Ky.
Miller, Conn.
Mills
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morton
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Norblad
Norton
O'Brien
O'Toole
Pace
Passman
Patman
Peden
Philbin
Pickett
Poage
Preston
Price, Fla.
Price, Ill.
Priest
Rains
Rayburn
Redden
Regan
Richards
Riley
Rivers
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Smathers
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.
Somers
Spence
Stanley
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Vinson
Walter
Wheeler
Whittington
Williams
Wilson, Tex.
Worley

NOT VOTING—70

Abernethy
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, N. Y.
Battle
Bell
Boykin
Bramblett
Bulwinkle
Butler
Clark
Clevenger
Clippinger
Coudert
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
D'Ewart
Dirksen
Donohue

Dorn	Kee	Plumley
Engle, Calif.	Kefauver	Powell
Fernandez	Kirwan	St. George
Fisher	Klein	Scoblick
Gallagher	Lane	Sheppard
Gore	Lichtenwalter	Sikes
Griffiths	Lusk	Stigler
Harris	Lyle	Stratton
Hartley	Meade, Md.	Taylor
Hébert	Miller, Calif.	Thomas, N. J.
Hedrick	Mitchell	Trimble
Hendricks	Morrison	Welch
Jarman	Multer	West
Jennings	Norrell	Whitaker
Johnson, Okla.	Peterson	Whitten
Johnson, Tex.	Pfeifer	Winstead
Kearney	Phillips, Tenn.	
Kearns	Ploeser	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Welch for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Gore against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Donohue against.

Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Engle of California against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Lichtenwalter for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. D'Ewart for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Jennings for, with Mr. Harris against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Clippinger for, with Mr. Kee against.

Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Scoblick for, with Mr. Norrell against.

Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Andrews of New York for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Griffiths with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Bramblett with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Phillips of Tennessee with Mr. Battle.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the legislation just passed, House Joint Resolution 342.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2287) entitled "An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes."

REPORT OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE ON AIR-MAIL SUBSIDY

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, today, on behalf of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I filed a report covering the subsidy paid to the air lines out of Post Office Department funds. This subsidy, it is estimated, amounts to between $15,000,000 and $17,000,000 annually.

In fiscal year 1947, expenditures for handling air mail exceeded revenues by $30,342,275. It can be seen that the subsidy paid to the air lines out of postal funds has a direct effect upon the large postal deficit which will this year amount to $375,000,000. The findings of the committee point to the fact that conditions have developed in handling the air-mail subsidy from postal funds similar to those which existed when the merchant marine subsidy was paid by the Post Office Department. As a result of abuses in the merchant marine subsidy, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was passed which provided that such subsidies as were given to the merchant marine would be separated from the postal funds and be paid pursuant to specific appropriations. A comparable change in the manner of subsidizing our air lines is needed. I should like to direct the attention of the House and particularly the members of the Appropriations Committee, to the recommendation that such subsidies as are necessary to carry out our air-line policies be made pursuant to direct appropriations and subject to the scrutiny of the Appropriations Committees of Congress. The Post Office Department should no longer be an unlimited source of funds which can be drawn upon at will by the Civil Aeronautics Board to carry out expensive experiments in our air-line pattern.

One of the extravagant policies of the Department which was the basis for the committee arriving at its conclusions is the feeder-line program. A high percentage of mail carried by feeder lines could be carried by trunk lines at a much reduced cost. The committee points out, for example, that Braniff and Pioneer air lines serve the same area. Braniff in 9 months of 1947 received $325,247.52 for carrying 543,978 ton-miles of mail. Pioneer received $752,153.68 for carrying 26,669 ton-miles of mail. In other words, Pioneer received more than twice as much money for carrying one-twentieth as much mail.

In a recent order—May 11, 1948—the Civil Aeronautics Board authorized a lump-sum payment of $1,893,658 to the Southwest Airways which is a feeder line. Nine hundred thirty-six thousand dollars of this amount represented an addition to mail pay already received. This payment is to cover the period December 2, 1946, to March 31, 1948. During that period this line carried 45,031 ton-miles of mail. As a comparison, it is pointed out that a service rate carrier would have transported over 4,200,000 ton-miles for this amount of money.

There is no relationship between the salaries paid officers of air lines and the size of their operation. For example, in a recent year one air line paid $50,000 in officers' salaries and at the same time was operating only two planes. Also at this time, more than 30 percent of this air line's operating revenue was derived from air-mail pay.

Another air line operating only three planes paid its officers, in the same year, over $40,000. This air line was also receiving more than 30 percent of its revenue from air-mail pay.

Under the policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant air-mail pay based on need rather than services performed, the Department has been called upon to pay excessive costs for carrying mail. Factors in these high costs are the high salaries of officers, stock warrants, and options given to officers, together with losses from poor management and over-expansion. In this report, the committee points out that when an industry is subsidized, a closer control of the capital structure is necessary than with an unsubsidized industry, because in the final analysis a portion of these expenditures are from Federal funds.

Recent actions by the Civil Aeronautics Board point toward an even greater diversion of postal funds to make up for the bad guesses of the air lines and the Board. Five million dollars annually has just been granted in increases to the service rate carriers. Four of the five carriers will receive this increase retroactively to January 1, 1948. The other receives it beginning May 19, 1948.

Mr. Speaker, one of the cornerstones of representative government is that Government funds may be spent only pursuant to appropriations. In the present Civil Aeronautics Board set-up we are permitting the spending of funds before approval of appropriations, and are giving our tacit consent to the questioned practice of deficiency appropriations. Also, by failing to separate the subsidy from air-mail pay we are keeping an iron curtain between the people and the amount spent on our aviation policy.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that a rule will be called up tomorrow when we meet at 11 and that general debate on the so-called Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, will be concluded tomorrow. If that is accomplished, it is our plan to adjourn until Monday.

Monday, of course, has been designated as the day for the holding of memorial services for deceased Members. That is all that will be taken up on Monday.

On Tuesday we propose to call both the Private and Consent Calendars, after which we will begin reading the Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, for amendment.

INTERSTATE COMPACT KILLED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in the history of our Nation an interstate compact has been killed.

The Southern Governors Conference entered into a compact for regional education within the area of the participating States, without expense to the National Government. Appropriate resolutions, seeking the consent of Congress, as required by the Constitution of the United States, were duly introduced in both Houses of Congress.

The House of Representatives, by a record vote of 236 to 45, passed House Joint Resolution 334, giving its consent to that compact on May 4, 1948.

The House is to be congratulated.

Today by a vote of 38 to 37, that compact was killed. One hundred and one of 102 compacts have been granted the consent of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Ways and Means Committee may have permission to sit tomorrow until 12 o'clock noon.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a summary of certain veterans' laws and a statement concerning the DAV.

H. R. 6446

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 6446, previously referred to the Committee on Public Lands, be rereferred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ISACSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Rabbi Dr. Jacob Hochman.

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CORRECTION OF ENROLLED BILL

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 200.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 3350, an act relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following corrections:

Strike out in lines 5 and 9, page 12 of the engrossed bill, the words "Secretary of War" and insert "Secretary of the Army."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permisison to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. GWINN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

BERMUDA PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY,
Bermuda, April 7, 1948.

The Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Member of Congress, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER MARTIN: As Speaker of the House of Assembly of the Parliament of Bermuda and joint president of the Bermuda banch of the Empire Parliamentary Association, I am writing to you to extend an invitation for four Members of your House of Representatives to visit Bermuda for a period of about 10 days from November 15, next.

During that time the Bermuda branch, in cooperation with the branch of the association in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and with the British-American parliamentary group, will be entertained in the colony delegations of members of all parties from the Parliaments of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australian Commonwealth, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa, and possibly also representatives from the Parliaments of India and Pakistan.

The Bermuda branch of the association were delighted to have the privilege of arranging the parliamentary gathering in Bermuda in 1946, when a delegation from both Houses of the Congress took part in an informal conference at Hamilton with representatives of the Parliaments of the British Commonwealth. If this invitation for November next is accepted, it is proposed to provide opportunities during the visit for similar informal conferences at which matters of common interest may be discussed.

The members of the Parliament of Bermuda were interested to hear that it was intended to hold a parliamentary conference in Bahamas in December last, but that for various reasons this conference had to be postponed. It was hoped at that time that the conference might be transferred to Bermuda and suggestions were made to that effect, but unfortunately sufficient time was not available for the transference to be effected. While any delegation from your House will of course be most welcome, it is naturally hoped that those Members who were chosen to go to the Bahamas may be able to attend as the delegates to the conference in November.

I take the opportunity of extending to you personally my most cordial greeting and an expression of deep admiration and respect.

Yours sincerely,

REGINALD CONYERS
(The Honorable Sir Reginald Conyers, CBE, Speaker, House of Assembly, and Joint President of the Bermuda Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association).

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 201) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Senate and the House of Representatives hereby accept the invitations tendered by the Speaker of the House of Assembly of Bermuda and joint president of the Bermuda branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association to have four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives attend a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association to be held in Bermuda beginning November 15, 1948. The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives are authorized to appoint the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives, respectively, to attend such meeting, and are further authorized to designate the chairmen of the delegations from each of the Houses. The expenses incurred by the members of the delegations appointed for the purpose of attending such meeting, which shall not exceed $5,000 for each of the delegations, shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members, upon submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation of which they are members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee to Make the Necessary Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-Elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1949 the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HALLECK, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. MCCORMACK.

VETERANS' HOMESTEAD HOUSING BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, since September 1947, the number of GI home-loan applications have dropped 43 percent. This does not indicate for a moment that our former servicemen do not want homes. It simply means that it is becoming increasingly difficult to find lending institutions which are willing and able to provide mortgages at the prescribed GI rate of 4 percent.

To aid in solving the housing problem and to meet the situation I have described, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has reported H. R. 4488, Veterans' Homestead Housing Act, an amendment

to the GI bill, introduced by me and 29 other Members of Congress at the request of the American Legion. Among other things, it would assure our veterans necessary funds for the purchase and construction of homes and provide a secondary market. This latter feature is expected to give more incentive for lending institutions to invest in GI mortgages.

To meet the need for funds for GI loans, the veterans' homestead bill which is now pending on the Union Calendar would make $750,000,000 available annually for 5 years for use by the Home Loan Bank Board to make investments in savings banks, cooperative banks, building and loan associations, and other organizations so as to provide the necessary financing. In distributing these funds preference would be given to those institutions willing to make 100 percent loans on a general individual limitation of $9,000 or not more than $10,000. I believe that these and other provisions will do much toward providing the badly needed homes for our veterans. The bill which was unanimously reported out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has many endorsements both by veterans and by Government departments and by businessmen. It is self-liquidating and will insure a reasonably low rate of interest to the veterans. I have asked the Rules Committee for a rule.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. FORAND, for the balance of the week, to attend as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

To Mr. MILLER of Maryland, for 3 days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3505. An act authorizing an appropriation for investigating the oyster beds damaged or destroyed by the intrusion of fresh water and the blockage of natural passages west of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Lake Mechant and Bayou Severin, Terrebonne Parish, La., and by the opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4892. An act to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.).

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2287. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 14, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1551. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a volume containing the acts of the fourth and fifth special sessions of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, June 23 to July 5 and November 24 to 29, 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1552. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $2,434,441,000 for the National Military Establishment (H. Doc. No. 652); 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. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1723. An act to amend the acts authorizing the courses of instruction at the United States Naval Academy and the United States Military Academy to be given to a limited number of persons from the American Republics so as to permit such courses of instruction to be given to Canadians; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1951). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1571. An act to promote the national defense by increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1952). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6441. A bill to create the Board of Postal Rates and Fees in the Post Office Department; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1957). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on air subsidy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1958). 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. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 188. An act for the relief of Dionisio R. Trevino; without amendment (Rept. No. 1953). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 511. An act for the relief of Francisco Gamboa Giocoechea; without amendment (Rept. No. 1954). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1451. An act for the relief of Perfecto M. Biason and Joan Biason; without amendment (Rept. No. 1955). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1637. An act for the relief of Leo Hamermann; without amendment (Rept. No. 1956). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Public Lands was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6446) to grant a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota, and the same was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6546. A bill to authorize the President to permit nationals of other nations to receive instruction and training in schools, training establishments, ships, units, and other installations maintained or administered by Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. R. 6547. A bill to provide for the mobilization of the scientific resources and knowledge of the United States for the purpose of seeking the causes and cure of heart disease and related blood diseases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6548. A bill to place an import duty on cotton and remove existing cotton import quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 6549. A bill to provide retirement pay and other benefits to certain disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 6550. A bill to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 6551. A bill to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHAFER (by request):

H. R. 6552. A bill to amend section 1700 (e) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6553. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due to and render judgment upon the claims of the employees of the Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 6554. A bill to protect the United States against un-American and subversive totalitarian activities; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 6555. A bill to relax, in certain cases, the standards for the admission of veterans to the bar of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 6556. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 6557. A bill to amend the act approved May 17, 1926, as amended by Public

Law 439, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved September 27, 1944, which defines line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. J. Res. 401. Joint resolution to continue until December 31, 1953, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation services to, from, and within Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. J. Res. 402. Joint resolution to exempt from levy of admissions tax the International Air Exposition and the Golden Anniversary Educational Exposition, being produced by the city of New York through the Mayor's Committee for the Commemoration of the Golden Anniversary of the City of New York; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. Con. Res. 198. Concurrent resolution to create a joint committee to formulate rules with respect to the powers, duties, and procedures of investigating committees of either House of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Con. Res. 199. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (H. Rept. No. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an advocate of overthrow of government by force and violence; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 6558. A bill for the relief of Harry B. Landers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6559. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 6560. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 6561. A bill for the relief of Stanley John Rybczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6562. A bill for the relief of James G. Smyth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6563. A bill for the relief of Mary Wyshoff; 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:

1913. By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Petition of postal employees, their friends and relatives, of the Wilmington post office, Wilmington, Del., containing 181 signatures and urging prompt favorable action by the Congress on the salary-increase bill for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1914. By Mr. HART: Memorial of the State of New Jersey, urging the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation amending the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1915. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of members of Shopiere Congregational Church, Shopiere, Wis., in opposition to universal military training and conscription; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1916. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Muhel Nassiff and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to increasing wages for Federal workers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1917. Also, petition of Mrs. A. Dework and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1918. Also, petition of M. Simon and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1919. Also, petition of Rise Wortman and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1920. Also, petition of Judeth Liebimen and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1921. Also, petition of Edith Wise and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of the legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1922. Also, petition of Matilde Monteregro and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1923. Also, petition of Ann Dunbar Williams and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting the Mundt-Nixon bill; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1924. Also, petition of Mrs. Albina Bibeau, St. Petersburg, 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.

1925. Also, petition of Bertha Gillman and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment into law House Joint Resolution 343 which lifts the arms embargo to Palestine Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1926. Also, petition of American Labor Party—First Assembly, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1927. Also, petition of Emily Ginsburg and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 14, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, May 10, 1948)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Father in Heaven, humbly we bow in prayer this day, feeling the deep loss of our Nation and the Senate in the call that has summoned our brother into that life where age shall not weary nor the years condemn.

Knowing in whom he placed his trust, we know that his faith was well founded.

We pray for those who loved him best and will miss him most. May they have the comforting ministry of Him who shall wipe away all tears from their eyes and is able to bind up broken hearts.

So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

May our sympathies be warm and real, and in our great loss may we learn better how to love one another, through Him who has promised, *Whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die. Because I live, ye shall live also.* Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 13, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

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 following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6500. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 342. Joint resolution directing all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to make available to any and all standing, special, or select committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate information which may be deemed necessary to enable them to properly perform the duties delegated to them by the Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to make corrections in the enrollment of H. R. 3350; and

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution accepting the invitation to attend the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 2287. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1308. An act for the relief of H. C. Biering;

H. R. 4966. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev.;

H. R. 5669. An act to provide for adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6067. An act authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6500. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.