Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6233. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described; with amendments (Rept. No. 2031). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6239. A bill to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 2032). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6335. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2033). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LOVE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6454. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation and apprehension of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 2034). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6502. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; without amendment (Rept. No. 2035). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1925. An act to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2036). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOFF:

H. R. 6692. A bill to advance knowledge on the history and culture of the American Indian through the acquisition and preservation of irreplaceable artifacts and relics; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6693. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the States of Minnesota and North Dakota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 6694. A bill to provide for equalization of flight pay for Navy and Marine Corps officers and former officers who did not receive flight pay equal to that paid to Army officers engaged in regular and frequent aerial flights; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 6695. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 6696. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to standards of safety and sanitation in the case of certain cars and equipment used in the movement of express traffic or baggage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 6697. A bill to authorize the sale and grant to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., of certain interests in public lands, and repealing a certain act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6698. A bill to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6699. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Department of the Air Force, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 6700. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States naval hospital at the naval shipyard at Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 6701. A bill to provide for the recall of officers to active duty for purposes of rehospitalization and evaluation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BAKEWELL (by request):

H. J. Res. 410. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim an annual national wear-a-flower week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. J. Res. 412. Joint resolution to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to strengthen the American merchant marine, to encourage investment in the American merchant marine to build more ships, and to remove inequities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. J. Res. 413. Joint resolution to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. J. Res. 414. Joint resolution designating March 30 of each year as Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. Con. Res. 205. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 25,000 copies of document entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go," jacket No. 94829; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of Memorial Masterpieces as a House document and authorizing the printing of 2,190 additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. Res. 612. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 604 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 614. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to investigate the hospitalization of veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 6702. A bill for the relief of First Lt. Harry S. Watcke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 6703. A bill for the relief of Peter D. Orahovats and Velislava Orahovats; 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:

2008. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of Amherst Grange, No. 16, of Amherst, Mass., urging our National Government to adopt a long-term agricultural policy which will provide for conservation of soil, water, forests, and wildlife; for proper land use; for maintenance of soil fertility; and for production of an adequate nutritious diet for its citizens; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2009. Also, petition of residents of western Massachusetts, urging the enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2010. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of George Meixner and 61 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, urging passage of House bill 6397, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2011. Also, petition of Jacob Scholl and 113 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, in support of House bill 5993, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2012. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the general convention of the Episcopal Church, urging the admission of 400,000 displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2013. Also, petition of the general convention of the Episcopal Church, urging the formation of a true federal union, either by amendment of the United Nations or through the formation of a regional defense pact under the provisions of chapter 8, paragraph 52, of the present Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2014. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of Yorkville Methodist Church, Yorkville, Wis., protesting against peacetime military conscription; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2015. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Morris Hankin and others, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act," to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

2016. Also, petition of Mrs. A. C. Rhudy, Sr., Tampa, Fla., and others, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan (H. R. 16); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 20, 1948)

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

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

O Lord our God, have pity upon us, who have so little pity in our hearts.

We give, but not in kindness.

We give because the sound of crying disturbs us and we want to be free to look after the things that concern ourselves.

We want peace without pain and security without sacrifice.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

We had to accept the responsibilities of war, but we do not want to accept the responsibilities of peace.

O Lord, be patient with us.

Give us yet more time to learn what love is, and how love should act, and how love can change us as individuals and as a nation.

We pray in the name of Him who loves us all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Tuesday, May 25, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 25, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 188. An act for the relief of Dionisio R. Trevino;

S. 315. An act for the relief of Reginald Mitchell;

S. 511. An act for the relief of Francisco Gamboa Giocoechea;

S. 1365. An act for the relief of Lowe Way Yuen and Dang Chee;

S. 1451. An act for the relief of Perfecto M. Biason and Joan Biason;

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Guy Cheng;

S. 1571. An act to promote the national defense by increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes;

S. 1651. An act to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946; and

S. 2233. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of a water main in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the United States naval air station, Alameda, Calif.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2277) to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2878) to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WELCH, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. D'EWART, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. PETERSON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3731. An act authorizing modifications in the repayment contracts with the Lower Yellowstone Irrigation District No. 1 and the Lower Yellowstone Irrigation District No. 2; and

H. R. 3785. An act to authorize the State of Minnesota to condemn lands owned by the United States in the county of Cass, State of Minnesota, for fish propagation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5298) to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

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

S. 1006. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, and the Potassium Act of February 7, 1927, in order to promote the development of certain minerals on the public domain; and for other purposes;

S. 2256. An act relating to the meat-inspection service of the Department of Agriculture;

H. R. 183. An act to transfer lot 1 in block 115, city of Fairbanks, Alaska, to the city of Fairbanks, Alaska;

H. R. 350. An act for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.;

H. R. 892. An act for the relief of Michel Ferapontow;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Doda Greenbaum (Brenner);

H. R. 1608. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1338);

H. R. 1916. An act for the relief of Filiberto A. Bonaventura;

H. R. 2218. An act for the relief of Lawrence Edgar Edwards;

H. R. 2384. An act for the relief of Colbert H. Cannon;

H. R. 2760. An act for the relief of Thomas Camarda;

H. R. 3344. An act to amend the fourth paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C. sec. 101), as amended;

H. R. 3358. An act for the relief of Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang and Dr. Esther Chang Liang;

H. R. 3526. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret K. Cahn;

H. R. 3578. An act to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3603. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other;

H. R. 3633. An act to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available home lands;

H. R. 3635. An act to ratify sections 1 and 2 of Joint Resolution 7 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in its regular session of 1947;

H. R. 3640. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte D. Wang, Harvey S. P. Wang, and Arthur Y. P. Wang;

H. R. 3644. An act for the relief of James M. Dingwall, Jr.; Aileen Reynolds; Bert Woolslayer; and Mrs. Maisie Purser Davis;

H. R. 3730. An act to amend section 20 (12) of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to recourse, by an initial or delivering carrier, against the carrier on whose line loss of, or damage or injury to, property is sustained, on account of expense incurred in defending actions at law;

H. R. 3954. An act to approve Act No. 74 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to revenue bonds of the Territory of Hawaii," and Act No. 95 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to Territorial and county public improvements and the financing thereof by the issuance of revenue bonds";

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of John H. Schmitt and Mrs. Mildred Schmitt;

H. R. 4091. An act to ratify Act 237 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947;

H. R. 4201. An act to authorize payments to the public-school district or districts serving the Fort Peck project, Montana, for the education of dependents of persons engaged on that project;

H. R. 4377. An act for the relief of the Consolidated Steel Corp., of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 4379. An act for the relief of the Harbor Boat Building Co.; the Wilmington Welding & Boiler Works; and B & R Machine Works, of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 4393. An act to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4426. An act to provide basic authority for certain functions and activities of the Weather Bureau, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4443. An act for the relief of Jacob Cohen;

H. R. 4484. An act for the relief of Theodore Loetsch;

H. R. 4512. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the State of Oklahoma for the use and benefit of the Northeastern State College, at Tahlequah, Okla.;

H. R. 4513. An act to eliminate the requirement of oaths in certain land matters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4551. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4593. An act for the relief of Abraham Spevak;

H. R. 4672. An act for the relief of John Cameron Henry;

H. R. 4804. An act to allow service credit for certain enlisted men of the Coast Guard who acted as policemen and guards at the Ivigtut Cryolite Mine, Greenland, during 1940 and 1941;

H. R. 4817. An act to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.);

H. R. 4823. An act to provide adequate school facilities within Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5122. An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512);

H. R. 5173. An act to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available home lands;

H. R. 5175. An act to confirm and ratify Act 205 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to the issuance of public-improvement bonds;

H. R. 5244. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II";

H. R. 5836. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army or his duly authorized representative to quitclaim a perpetual easement over certain lands adjacent to the Fort Myers Army Airfield, Fla.;

H. R. 5839. An act to authorize the conveyance to States or political subdivisions of roads leading to certain historical areas administered by the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5870. An act to amend the act of May 16, 1946 (Public Law 383, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide increased allowances for the escorts of repatriated war dead;

H. R. 5901. An act to provide for the distribution among the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming of the receipts of the Colorado River Development Fund for use in the fiscal years 1949 to 1955, inclusive, on a basis which is as nearly equal as practicable and to make available other funds for the investigation and construction of projects in any of the States of the Colorado River Basin in addition to appropriation for said purposes from the Colorado River Development Fund;

H. R. 5922. An act relating to the issuance of reentry permits to certain aliens;

H. R. 6203. An act to incorporate the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington a corporation sole;

H. R. 6209. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the District of Columbia," approved January 6, 1893, as amended;

H. R. 6302. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, to permit the exercise of certain options on or before August 8, 1950;

S. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1948, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace;

H. J. Res. 339. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp series in honor of volunteer firemen;

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the golden anniversary of the consolidation of the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond, which boroughs now comprise New York City;

H. J. Res. 379. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1949;

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1949.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask permission of the Senate for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] to be absent from the Senate until Monday, June 7, on strictly unofficial business. The Senator from New Hampshire is being married this afternoon. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire has the congratulations of all his colleagues in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is entered, and the congratulations are endorsed.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which is engaged in hearing testimony with respect to the nomination of Roy W. Harper for appointment to the Federal bench in Missouri may be permitted to hold a session this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent that the subcommittee of the Small Business Committee investigating the shortage of oil and petroleum products may continue to sit during the session this afternoon.

He also asked and obtained consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering the nomination of Samuel Hamilton Kaufman to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe the RECORD will disclose that the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] was to be recognized when the Senate convened today, under a unanimous-consent order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

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

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

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

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

The business before the Senate is Senate bill 2242, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. Under the unanimous-consent order of yesterday, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak to Senate bill 2242, which relates to the admission into the United States of a total of 100,000 displaced persons during the next two fiscal years. In approaching the subject I wish to say that there has been a great deal of misunderstanding as to what might be called the general over-all immigration situation, as is evidenced by the mail received by Senators and my statements of groups which have appeared in Washington in our offices and elsewhere.

Mr. President, pursuant to the resolution agreed to on July 26, 1947, known as Senate Resolution 137, there was set up under the Committee on the Judiciary a subcommittee. To head that subcommittee I appointed the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. The subcommittee had as its function, first, a study and analysis of the whole immigration problem; and second, a study and analysis of the displaced persons problem.

The members of the so-called displaced persons subcommittee, besides the chairman, were the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH]. As has been stated on the floor, under the plan of organization of the Judiciary Committee, I, as chairman of the committee, am ex officio a member of every subcommittee.

The subcommittee was joined by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Jersey representing the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senator from Virginia representing the Committee on Armed Services, both acting in an advisory capacity to the subcommittee. A staff was activated, and a program of study and investigation inaugurated in relation to the problem of displaced persons.

A number of members of the subcommittee went to Europe, as did a part of the staff. I did not accompany the subcommittee. However, I preceded the subcommittee on my own account and responsibility.

The subcommittee returned and held a number of hearings. It was my priv-

ilege to attend several of them. At those hearings I became aware of the fact that the members of the subcommittee were not agreed as to what the bill to be reported from the committee should contain. Let me say parenthetically that this is a committee bill. I had nothing to do with drafting the bill; yet through some fortuitous circumstance my name became attached to it, and I became the very pleasant target of all America. Pamphlets were published by the hundreds of thousands criticizing me and criticizing the bill. I have no apology to make for the bill, because I am speaking in favor of it today. It is the result of the work of three members of the subcommittee, namely, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. As I understand, the other two members of the subcommittee have introduced a substitute bill.

As I stated at the beginning, pursuant to the resolution of this body the subcommittee was constituted with two great functions. We cannot devote all our attention to one and disregard the other.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to make a comment on the statement made a few moments ago by my good friend the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin. He stated that when the bill came from the committee it was a committee bill, and that as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary his name was attached to the bill. He stated that the bill has been the subject of criticism. He knows that I have not agreed with all the provisions of the bill. But, as one member of the subcommittee, I should like to say that those who criticize the bill ignore entirely the fact that it is the first bill in the interest of displaced persons which has actually reached the stage of debate and decision.

Second, it announces the policy that this country will treat the problem as a problem entirely separate from immigration policy and that we will resettle a certain number of displaced persons.

A third great principle which it enunciates is that we do not accept displaced persons solely upon the ground of the self-interest of this country. It does not propose that displaced persons be selected solely upon the basis of the tasks which they might perform in this country. It accepts family groups and if this bill is passed I believe that we will be the first nation to select displaced persons in family groups.

Although as one member of the subcommittee I have not agreed with all the provisions of the bill, and have joined in amendments which I think improve it. I must emphasize that it enunciates great princples. I do not believe that the critics and the newspapers have sensed and taken into account this fundamental fact.

Mr. WILEY. I thank my good friend from Kentucky. I appreciate his words. So far as I am personally concerned, the criticisms have rolled off me like water off a duck's back. But, Mr. President, I know what the subcommittee has done. I know that before the immigration subcommittee have come hundreds of bills, some relating to very questionable characters in connection with immigration into this country.

The subcommittee has sweated week in and week out at the job of formulating a great policy. The only reason I mention the criticism is that the other day in the city of Washington I happened to be among a group of businessmen, I bring this point into the open because it is so important for all America to understand it. At various sessions of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States talks were made by Senators and by businessmen. Following one of these sessions there was a luncheon around a small table. The subject under discussion was not idle gossip. The question was, "What can I do when I go back home." One of the answers was, "I will not indulge in curbstone advice or snap judgment. I will get all the facts, and I will not condemn or criticise on the basis of superficial knowledge." I wish to God that that attitude could be adopted throughout America, and that groups which have selfish interests could follow the Biblical injunction, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." I am not speaking about myself. I am speaking about the subcommittee, which has labored and got results.

Mr. President, I have said that we cannot discuss one phase of the immigration problem—and, after all, the question of displaced persons is an immigration problem—without understanding the general over-all problem. The United States for many years has had an immigration policy which has been established by the legislative branch of the Government. It has been a wise policy. I am not criticizing those who say that under this bill 200,000 persons, instead of 100,000, should be admitted. If they have arrived at that honest conclusion, that is their right. But, Mr. President, under the quota allotted to Europe, 150,000 persons are allowed to enter the United States each year. I am not now talking about displaced persons; I am talking about the immigration quota, and I say that under the quota 150,000 persons from Europe are allowed to enter the United States each year. In addition to those who are admitted under the quota, there is the group of persons who are admitted on a nonquota basis. Last year, 76,000 more persons entered the United States on a nonquota basis. So, instead of having a total of 150,000 persons admitted to the United States from Europe during one year under the quota, as many as 300,000 persons in addition could be admitted on a nonquota basis.

Now we are asked to pass a bill relating to displaced persons which would permit, in addition to the present quota and nonquota number, the entry of 50,000 displaced persons each year for 2 years, or a total of 100,000. Let me make that clear: We have a quota for Europe of 150,000 persons a year. Last year we had, in addition to that, an actual immigration into the United States on a nonquota basis of 76,000 persons. Now it is desired to add, on top of that, another 100,000, or 50,000 displaced persons for each of the 2 years 1949 and 1950.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us more about the 76,000 persons coming from Europe last year, in addition to the 150,000?

Mr. WILEY. Of course, it is necessary to understand the nonquota provisions. The nonquota provisions apply to relatives, such as a husband, a wife, or a child under 21 years of age. As I have said, 76,000 persons in that group entered the United States last year. A large number of them were the wives of American soldiers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the nonquota system, would there be any way by which the displaced persons could be taken care of to some extent?

Mr. WILEY. As a matter of fact, under the Presidential order of December 22, 1945—and in referring to the nonquota group, I am not referring to displaced persons—90 percent of the visas issued in Germany and Austria were allocated to displaced persons.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, does the Senator have any figures to indicate the number of displaced persons who have entered the United States since the end of the war?

Mr. WILEY. By June 30 there will be approximately 50,000, even though the displaced-persons law is not yet on the statute books.

Mr. President, I have stated these figures for the reason that there is a general misunderstanding about this matter. It is believed that we are being asked to pass a general immigration law and that we are trying to restrict the entrance of people into the United States. However, that is not true. This committee is not ready to report, and will not be ready to report until next year, on any of the plans in relation to a revision of the general immigration laws or in relation to the quotas.

All this bill does, as has been stated dynamically by my dear friend, the Senator from Kentucky, is for the first time in history, by the action of the Government of the United States, to lead the way, by legislative means, in beginning to handle the problem presented by displaced persons—in this case, 1,300,000 of them. When the war was over, there were approximately 8,000,000 displaced persons, and now that number has been reduced to 1,300,000. So the job which has been done in that respect is not at all a bad one. When we hear statements about the terrible conditions of the displaced persons today, such statements are not at all correct. The people in the displaced-persons camps are being fed better than are the Germans who are outside the camps. The record shows that those who are in the camps are receiving approximately 250 to 500 more calories a day than are the people who live outside the camps in those countries. Obviously, Mr. President, a great deal that is said about this entire situation is not correct.

But we are facing this problem: Under the United Nations, as will be remembered, an attempt was made to create an International Refugee Organization. In view of the fact that it has not come

into being, because the requisite number of nations have not consented to it, there has been set up a PCIRO, or Preparatory Commission of the International Refugee Organization. That is the group which is undertaking to feed and look after the displaced persons. So, Mr. President, we are faced with the necessity of determining how many displaced persons shall be admitted into the United States, in addition to the other persons who are being admitted, as I have stated. We must decide how many we can handle in this country during the next year.

I wish to state generally that, as suggested by the Senator from Kentucky when he spoke a few moments ago, this is an experiment; it is a new step. We are dealing with the displaced-person problem at a time when we know that all over the world Communists wish to enter the United States; we are dealing with it when this afternoon the Judiciary Committee will consider again, in executive session, the Mundt bill, which provides for the handling of the Communist situation, so far as possible, in the United States.

I should like to refer to what the committee has said about the Communist problem. I refer now to page 20 of the report. We considered the possibility that Communists would infiltrate the displaced-persons' camps and eventually would gain entrance into the United States; and we discussed the matter with some of the consular officials. The opinion was expressed that the situation was tailor-made for effecting illegal entry into the United States on false documents, because it is difficult to verify identifying data or to check the proof of nationality. Attention was called to one or two cases in which Communists had presented false documents and had been caught. The testimony shows that 40 percent of the applications for visas were forged by persons wishing to enter the United States.

Mr. President, it will not be my purpose at this time to comment at great length on the proposed legislation which now is pending. Senate bill 2242 represents, as I have stated, very long and arduous work on the part of the Immigration Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, under the able chairmanship of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. At the request of the full committee, I reported the bill to the Senate. It is a committee bill, and there was only one dissenting vote in the committee at that time. Although this proposed legislation bears my name, as I have already stated it is the committee bill. I had nothing to do with the drafting of the bill. However, I adopt it. It is a subcommittee bill, having been written in the first instance by the subcommittee and then adopted by the full committee. It was reported to the floor of the Senate by the committee. I personally voted for the bill in the full committee because I believed it to be a practical measure.

Beyond the quota and nonquota entries to which I have already referred, 50,000 additional persons can be siphoned into the United States, if they are properly screened to protect our national interests, to say nothing of what are our needs in this country, and where those persons are to be placed. I have had group after group come to my office and suggest the rules which should apply, but when I asked them, "How many will you take?" not one of them said, "I will take one." When I asked, "How many will you guarantee?" not one of them said, "I will take them, or give a guaranty."

Mr. President, some fine work has been done by resettlement commissions in various States. The other day I telegraphed to the Wisconsin Committee on Resettlement of Displaced Persons, which had been set up by Governor Rennebohm, regarding facilities that might be available in my own State for DP's. I have received the following telegram in response:

MADISON, WIS., *May 25, 1948.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Based on survey conducted by governor's committee, Wisconsin will have no difficulty in finding suitable employment and housing for about 3,000 families or in terms of individuals upward of 10,000. Rural Wisconsin offers more employment opportunities and housing than urban areas. Survey encountered no significant opposition to proposal of resettlement of displaced persons and in contrast found sufficient individuals and groups of people enthusiastically in favor of proposal so there is no question about Wisconsin's ability to absorb its share and more of the admissions authorized in your Senate bill. Letter follows.

Prof. GEORGE W. HILL,
Chairman, Wisconsin Committee on Resettlement of Displaced Persons.

Mr. President, I have not yet received the letter. Today I am personally very happy that the members of that committee feel Wisconsin will absorb some farmers. The bill provides that 50 percent of the quota should go to the farms, where they are needed. The farmers all over America need help. But the strange thing is, during all these months, no communication has been sent to me indicating who will take immigrants who are in the displaced persons category. Many committees came to Washington. If I had accepted the generalities of those who came to my office, Mr. President, I could have reached the conclusion that this country was ready to take millions of displaced persons and absorb them and house them.

Mr. President, where are we to put the displaced persons who may come to our shores? Two million or more veterans coming out of college must have jobs. Our young folks are growing up. A housing problem exists in every community in the United States. Two million married couples in America are now sharing small quarters with others. These are facts we must consider, over and above the lot of the displaced persons in Europe. This is America, our home. We want good blood to come to this country. But we do not want any "rats"—we have enough of them. We want to be careful how we handle the problem, because it is dynamite. Every time we have fooled around with Joe Stalin, as the facts show, we have generally been taken for a ride. There is no need of our opening up the gates, in this world crisis, to an influx of immigrants, if there is any question about their character and their ability to be absorbed into our way of life.

Yes, Mr. President, there has been widespread criticism of some of the provisions of the bill. Some have felt that the number of displaced persons to be allowed into our country is too small. Others have protested against the preference provision for agricultural workers or from DP's from the Baltic lands and from Poland east of the Curzon line. Others have protested against the provisions which prevent displacement of our own American people from jobs and housing and any elaborate assurance in advance that such will not occur.

Let me say here, that displaced persons are being looked after, and we are paying the major portion of the bill. But they are being looked after in Europe. If there are jobs for them here, and if, after a trial period, we can put 50,000 of them through the screening process between now and next January, and can get our mechanism in shape so it will operate, and there are jobs and houses in this country for a greater number, there is no reason why, at that time, we should not increase the allotment. But that does not suit certain groups in this country.

Mr. President, I call attention to those who are in favor of the suggested number of 50,000. I shall mention first the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], with the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and then the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. The 50,000 provision was the result of much discussion, I can understand. There are those who say it should be 100,000.

Let it be demonstrated on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President, that jobs are available, and that there are those who have houses who will take these people. Let us not indulge in mere generalities. Many committees have been working on this question now for many months, and some of them have been paid very good sums to head up organizations to disseminate propaganda, as in the case of oleomargarine. One committee, organized for purposes of propaganda, as shown by the record, had a pay roll of $152,000, with which to endeavor to influence the Senate group.

Each of these matters will be handled by amendments that are expected to be submitted from the Senate floor. The merits of the amendments will be debated, and I shall not at this time attempt to evaluate their merits, beyond what I have already said.

I do, however, want to make the point that I believe the work of the Immigration Sucommittee should be recognized in analyzing this problem on an objective basis and over a long period of time with testimony from the most informed sources available on this tremendous problem. The judgment of the subcommittee on any of these counts should not lightly be rejected. While neither I nor any of my colleagues will take that judgment as the final word on the situation, I believe that we should give it our most careful consideration.

At the same time, while bearing in mind our humanitarian obligations to

the stricken displaced persons in Europe, we must also remember our obligations to this dear land of ours. I call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that 40 percent of the applications for visas to our country from DP's have been fraudulent, and that entry into our land by DP's provides a golden opportunity for agents of Soviet Russia to enter America.

These facts should not be forgotten. We should not, in our zeal to fulfill our humanitarian responsibilities, forget our responsibilities to our own land and to our own people.

We are paying most of the bill over there. A problem is involved which needs care and attention. It must not be solved through an emotional approach. When I say that, I am not condemning those who want their relatives, persons of their own kin and blood, to come to this country. I know the ties which exist. I am a son of immigrants. My mother came to this country at the age of 3 years, before the Civil War. But, Mr. President, I am first, last, and always an American. I know that in these troublous times we should not let our emotions divert us from the real job in which we are engaged, which is protecting the people of America.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, the facts which I have stated should not be forgotten. We should not, in our zeal to fulfill our humanitarian responsibilities, forget our responsibilities to our own land and to our own people.

I am hoping that some DP legislation will pass, but it is obvious that if we here attempt to write an impractical and visionary formula for such legislation, it definitely will not succeed, and we will place an impossible task upon whoever is charged with administering the DP program.

The question, therefore, is how to reconcile our action with our obligations to our own people and our obligations to the displaced persons. I do not believe these obligations are inconsistent or contradictory. I know that we will be adequate to the purpose of working out an equitable formula.

I think this bill provides for that. It is an experiment, Mr. President. We speak of adding to the existing quota and nonquota list 50,000 more displaced persons who have to be screened. We are putting that additional work on the Immigration Bureau, or whatever department of the Government is to handle the question. We do not want it done in any lax way, and I hope that none of us here will be carried away by emotion, by false charges or prejudice, or any similar phony claim.

We all know that we are all descendants of immigrants who came to the new world and found in it a paradise of opportunity. I know that there are other potential immigrants now in Europe who could render wonderful account of themselves and could make real contributions to our land, but there are also in Europe Soviet agents and others of extremely questionable loyalty and extremely questionable value to our land.

For the sake of the worthy DP's whose name would be tarnished by the other group to which I have referred, for the sake of our own country, I ask that my colleagues give their very careful consideration to this legislation and arrive at their judgment on the basis of the facts and the merits of the case.

I think I have a particular reason for special interest in this bill, because at this time plans are under way for the embarking of 4 ships in what is known as the Wisconsin Centennial Friendship Fleet. The first of these will leave for Norway tomorrow. These ships will carry with them the gifts and good wishes of Americans of Wisconsin to the lands of their forefathers—the Scandinavian and the Low Countries. On the return trip, these friendship fleet boats are expected to bring back immigrants who might not otherwise have been able to come to our shores because of the terrific lack of passenger ship facilities. Later on this summer, it is possible that a friendship fleet boat may go to western Germany, from which come so many of our finest Wisconsin people.

The whole State of Wisconsin is particularly a vast combination of foreign cultures and peoples blended into a new race of men—the American race.

Yes, no one can say that we of Wisconsin lack sympathy with the problems of the displaced persons.

AMERICA'S CHRISTIAN OBLIGATIONS

We recognize, too, that not only must we, as Americans, extend the hand of friendship to these displaced persons, but we who profess to be Christians, and who profess to follow the creed of the Master of Galilee, must, in the great American tradition, extend our hand and our haven to the footsore, the weary, the persecuted, the downtrodden. We recognize our humanitarian obligations. We recognize, too, that America has been propelled to leadership among the nations of earth and that all the other countries are watching America and the way in which we proceed with this displaced-persons problem.

As Americans, therefore—and I speak of Christians in terms of the spirit of nobility, of generosity, of charity, of help, rather than in terms of any one particular faith—we must approach this bill with the most sympathetic understanding.

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST RECKLESSNESS

At the same time, Mr. President, we must all be aware of the real practicalities in this situation. Let me emphasize a few:

First. As reported in the committee report on displaced persons, more than 40 percent of the applications for visas to our country have been found to be fraudulent. The reason for this is that obviously the displaced persons group provides a wonderful opportunity for Soviet agents and saboteurs to infiltrate the ranks. Unless we set up careful screening machinery, we shall find that our land will have been further invaded by Russian agents, who will not only seek to "termite" our institutions, but who will tarnish the name of the displaced persons themselves. We in the Judiciary Committee are now considering the Mundt-Nixon bill to control subversive activities. It would be ridiculous for us to report any legislation such as this and at the same time to seek special legislation which would merely permit a flood of Russian agents to enter our land.

Second. The processing of displaced persons is a tremendous and complicated job. It will take a considerable number of men and a considerable amount of time. If we set the figure in this bill too high, then we will have set an unattainable and unreachable goal which simply cannot be fulfilled within a period of 12 months or 24 months. Why fool displaced persons abroad into believing that we can process a tremendous number of them within a short period of time? Why break their hearts and break our promises by setting up unattainable goals?

Third. The Judiciary Committee adopted certain preference provisions for agricultural individuals, of whom we have a terrific need in our land, and for other folks who would not displace Americans from jobs or housing. Would it not be cruel to bring displaced persons into our land into already overfilled occupations and overfilled areas? Is it not wiser to make advance preparations for them and to make sure that they will be adequately taken care of rather than simply allow them to pour into our land and then suffer the consequences of lack of preparations?

Mr. President, some fine work has been done by resettlement commissions in various States. I have already placed in the RECORD the telegram which I received from Prof. George W. Hill, chairman of the Wisconsin Committee on Resettlement of Displaced Persons. Wisconsin, a State of 3,300,000 people, is confronted with the question of whether it can absorb 3,000 heads of families. We need something more definite than the information we have received. I shall telegraph Professor Hill again and ask him for the names and addresses of persons who will, if this bill shall become law, actually take in DP's.

I am satisfied that there are certain industries which can use additional help. I know that American tailors could use foreign tailors. There should be no problem in that regard. If the people in New York and elsewhere want tailors, and the foreign tailors pass the test and jobs can be provided which will not displace Americans, they should be taken care of.

Mr. President, there is another provision of the bill which should bear real scrutiny from the standpoint of merit. The record discloses that there are between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 noncitizens in this country. When they came here in the past they had a tendency to settle in the large cities. There they form a whirlpool of foreign isms and create many of our problems. We do not want to add to that whirlpool. There are those abroad who seek homes and havens and jobs here, and want to work and produce and become Americans. On the broad prairies, in the villages and cities throughout the land, without going into the large metropolitan centers, there is plenty of room for them. The problem then arises whether there are houses for them, whether there are those who will guarantee to look after them, or whether

we will get them over here and turn them loose, and perhaps open up displaced persons camps on this continent.

Mr. President, it is not as simple a problem as some of our emotional friends would make it out to be. Wisconsin, of course, is but one State in the Union which has made surveys and studies, and I trust that those who are going to argue for the hundred thousand a year will have gotten what I have been unable to get up to date, namely, a summation of the studies of the various State groups, not mere generalities, but actual, concrete results, and will place them before this body. If that is done, and it can be demonstrated that we should change the figure in the bill to 100,000, and it can be proved that jobs are available, that the displaced persons will not be turned loose on the communities, and that there are houses available, I am sure the subcommittee and the committee itself will be the first to say "Amen." But such demonstration is lacking.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat, mere promises will not make houses or jobs. What we need are guaranties in order to insure that these immigrants will not be left out in the cold, helpless and friendless, when they arrive on our shores, and will not become public charges and a drain on the already overstrained capacity of our congested cities, villages, and homesteads.

Mr. President, I stand ready to abide by the wishes of my colleagues in regard to the pending legislation. I shall respect their opinions. I think the present situation is such that no man can claim that he is omniscient. I merely ask my colleagues to bear in mind the realities which I have mentioned, rather than allow themselves to be swept away, or pressured away, if you please.

Mr. President, to give an example of pressure, the Mundt bill had not even come to the Senate, or been assigned by the President pro tempore to the Committee on the Judiciary before telegrams and letters began to come to the committee from all over the country. We had not even gotten the bill, but someone had told certain groups to put on the pressure. One hundred and fifty-two thousand dollars was spent by one committee pressuring Members of Congress on this subject in 1 year, as appears from figures in the clerk's office.

For the sake of our own land, for the sake of the displaced persons themselves, we have to make sure that if we are to proceed along this line we shall go forward with calmness and judgment, with practicality and a realistic appraisal of the facts involved in the performance of our Christian and humanitarian obligations.

Mr. President, something was said the other day about this being a dark cloud on American conduct, or something to that effect. I deny that. I say one can search the annals of mankind from the dawn of history, and no record can be found of a people having done what we are doing, of a people having contributed as we have contributed. Never have people reached out to help their enemies as we have done. During the coming year we will spend $450,000,000 in Germany, plus $800,000,000, to help rehabilitate those people.

Mr. President, that is all the more reason, as we proceed along these lines to give of our sustenance, that we proceed with caution, to the end that the termites may not be permitted to begin their work. And by that term I do not mean to infer that the displaced persons are termites. Some might not believe me when I say that in the camps I visited the people were happy, they were out from under the influence of Joe Stalin, they were producing, they were even building, they had shops and were creating things, and they were well fed. All I urge is that we proceed to carry forward whatever plan we develop, and let it be with a song in our hearts and a light in our eyes, with a prayer on our lips that we will do the job and do it well, if we are going to help the displaced persons and not injure our own country.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations; that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and assigned to service on the Committee on Public Works; that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and assigned to service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL] be assigned to service on the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TRANSFER OF PORTION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CENTER AT LOS ANGELES FOR USE OF UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration Center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 1560. A bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1397).

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

S. 2554. A bill to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1409).

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

S. 2174. A bill to amend further sections 10 and 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended (37 U. S. C. 110 and 112), relating to allowances; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1398).

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

S. 2553. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1399).

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

S. 2622. A bill to provide that personnel of the National Guard of the United States and the Organized Reserve Corps shall have a common Federal appointment or enlistment as Reserves of the Army of the United States, to equalize disability benefits applicable to such personnel, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1400).

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

S. 2505. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1408).

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

H. R. 5283. A bill to provide for the disposal of surplus sand at Fort Story, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1402).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1183. A bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1410);

S. 1274. A bill confirming the claim of A. B. Learned to certain lands in the State of Mississippi, county of Wilkinson; with amendments (Rept. No. 1411);

S. 1275. A bill confirming the claim of Miss Lucille Romano to certain lands in the State of Mississippi, county of Warren; with amendments (Rept. No. 1412);

H. R. 3680. A bill to amend sections 207, 213, 215, 216, 220, 222, and 225 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1403);

H. R. 4954. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance under Federal reclamation laws of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington; without amendment (Rept. No. 1404);

H. R. 6056. A bill to amend an act of Congress approved February 9, 1881, which granted a right-of-way for railroad purposes through certain lands of the United States in Richmond County, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1405); and

H. R. 6091. A bill to withdraw certain land as available land within the meaning of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 (42 Stat. 108), as amended, and to restore it to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 1406).

By Mr. FLANDERS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2746. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1407).

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

S. 1260. A bill to provide for the settlement and payment to certain motor carriers of

claims against the United States for damages resulting from Federal possession, control, and operation in time of war of the carriers' transportation systems and properties; to provide for just compensation to such carriers for the use of such transportation systems and properties during such possession, control, and operation; and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1414).

INCORPORATION OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report an original bill to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company, and I submit a report (No. 1401) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill and report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2747) to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

PROCUREMENT, ETC., OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I ask unanimous consent to report an original bill to organize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1413) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill and report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2754) to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 26, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1006. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, so as to increase the acreage of sodium leases which may be issued in any State to a person, association, or corporation;

S. 2256. An act relating to the meat-inspection service of the Department of Agriculture; and

S. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1948, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 2746. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original bill (S. 2747) to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER (for Mr. BUSHFIELD):

S. 2748. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue Katherine Nelson a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 2749. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Kate Charging Cloud Bear Doctor a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2750. A bill for the relief of Lee Wee and Chan Suey; and

S. 2751. A bill for the relief of Peter I. Tirbak and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2752. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the Appalachian region for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. BALL, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. COOPER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. JENNER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REED, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THYE, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2753. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to provide emergency aid and coordinate the activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported an original bill (S. 2754) to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REVERCOMB (by request):

S. 2755. A bill to amend the act of June 11, 1946, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. ECTON, Mr. CAIN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. CHAVEZ) introduced Senate bill 2756, to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 244), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized under Senate Resolution 148, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 25, 1947, authorizing the Committee on Public Lands (now the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs) to make a study and investigation of any matter referred to it, is hereby increased by $25,000.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—AMENDMENT

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

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, 1949—AMENDMENT

Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. LUCAS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LUCAS to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

Strike out the proviso on page 3, beginning on line 20 and ending on line 25.

NAVIGATION AND FLOOD-CONTROL WORK ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—ARTICLE BY THOMAS L. STOKES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the noted columnist and writer, Thomas L. Stokes, writing in the Boston Traveler, and the other newspapers which carry his column, has written an article on the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 200, the joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to provide that in the election of President and Vice President of the United States electoral votes be counted in proportion to the popular vote.

As Senators know, three times in our history the candidate who received the greatest number of popular votes for President did not become President. The proposed amendment would correct that very obvious and dangerous defect in our system of electing the President of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stokes' article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

"NATIONAL AFFAIRS"

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, May 20.—Congress has a splendid chance at this session to start a long-needed reform on its way. This is abolition of the antique and outmoded electoral-college system and substitution of popular election of our Presidents.

The opportunity is offered in a proposed constitutional amendment which has been reported favorably from the Judiciary Committees of both House and Senate and is waiting on the calendar. Passage by the necessary two-thirds of each branch would send it to the States, of which approval by three-fourths is needed for ratification.

The amendment would abolish the electoral college but retain the electoral votes. Under it, each candidate would receive the proportion of the electoral vote of each State to which his popular vote entitled him. For example, if the Republican candidate received 60 percent of the popular vote in Ohio and the Democratic candidate 40 percent, the Republican would get 15 electoral

votes and the Democrat 10. As it is now, the Republican would get all 25. And so on with every State.

Congress not only has the opportunity to do something now, but it also has today a glaring example of how the electoral system might be abused. This is in the South where, as we are aware, plans are afoot among Democratic organizations in a few States to withhold the electoral vote from President Truman because of his civil-rights program.

There is no certainty that these States will go through with their plan, but if they do, the result will be to place in the hands of a few men the right to cast the vote of the State, no matter how the people vote. The people would be voting blind. Many might vote for President Truman. He might get a majority. But, if the plot goes through, these votes wouldn't count.

There's another possibility in the South this year. Because of southern resentment against the President, there is a chance that a Republican might carry one or more of the States that used this device—rather remote, it is true. But unless the electors decided to cast their votes for the Republican candidate in such an event, which they would hardly be likely to do, the people who voted for the Republican would be disfranchised. If the electors decided to cast their votes for a third candidate, then the people's votes for neither the Democrat nor the Republican would count.

This is merely cited as an example of what could happen. The proposed amendment would not apply to the 1948 election. But it does have application to the future and to such a contingency as has occurred three times in our history, when the candidate who got the biggest popular vote lost the Presidency through the electoral system. The amendment would also open the way for giving us still more democracy and for strengthening our two-party system.

Under the electoral system, many voters do not get any recognition or representation, since the candidate who wins a majority in a State gets the entire electoral vote. A proportionate allotment would recognize the minority in the electoral count. We would not have had the lopsided electoral votes of the last few national elections had such a system been in effect.

The proposed change would help the two parties to build up their strength in sections where elections now almost go by default—as with Republicans, for example, in the South. Recognition of their votes in the proportional-electoral-vote method would induce Republican Presidential candidates to campaign in the South.

Senator LODGE (Republican, of Massachusetts), sponsor of the proposed constitutional amendment in the Senate, pointed out that Governor Dewey, of New York, would have received 28.906 electoral votes in the South in 1944 under a proportional electoral system. Instead, he received none. LODGE suggested that, had the amendment been in effect in 1944, Republicans would have campaigned in the South and Governor Dewey might have got a million more popular votes there.

The Senator also explained that the proposed change would prevent concentration of Presidential campaigning in the State of big populations with the big electoral prizes that go to the majority—and often a thin one. This would eliminate the desperate angling for votes in those areas, the use of all sorts of issues that stir up passions and prejudice, as is often done to appeal to minorities of various kinds, and the intensity that contributes to corruption.

WAINWRIGHT SHIPYARD, PANAMA CITY, FLA.—ARTICLE FROM PANAMA CITY HERALD

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Panama City (Fla.) Herald relating to a Senate committee report on the Wainwright Shipyard, of Panama City, Fla., which appears in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 2277, to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, and so forth, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2277) to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, and 5.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1 and 2; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That no property shall be determined under this paragraph to be suitable or desirable for use as an historic-monument except in conformity with the recommendation of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments established by section 3 of the Act entitled 'An Act for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes', approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), and no property shall be so determined to be suitable or desirable for such use if (A) its area exceeds that necessary for the preservation and proper observation of the historic-monument situated thereon, or (B) it was acquired by the United States at any time subsequent to January 1, 1900."

And amend the Senate engrossed bill as follows:

On page 3, line 16, strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof ", and."

On page 3, line 17, strike out the semicolon and all thereafter to and including "(61 Stat. 202)" in line 21, page 3.

On page 4 strike out all in lines 7–21, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 3. Section 18 (e) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby repealed."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
HARRY F. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
MELVIN C. SNYDER,
CARTER MANASCO,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this is a conference report on the bill providing for the disposal of surplus property. The conferees agreed substantially on the bill as it passed the Senate. There are only two changes in the bill as it was passed by this body. One defines a little more accurately what is a historic monument, and puts it up to the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, to advise the Secretary of the Interior as to what in their opinion is a historic monument.

The only other change is a technical one, made necessary by the passage by the Congress and the signature by the President of a bill extending the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The passage of that bill made necessary the elimination of one section of Senate bill 2277, which concerns the RFC disposing of property to small business.

Mr. President, those are the only two changes in the conference report from the bill as it passed the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, yesterday, during the course of the debate on the displaced persons legislation the question was raised as to the amount of money already contributed by the United States to the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization, and the percentages to be paid by the different participating countries. In order to clarify the record I have had an investigation made and a statement prepared which I desire to present for the RECORD at this time, pointing out, I think accurately, what the exact situation is, both as to the participation by our country and by other countries, and the understanding with regard to the matter.

In order to clarify this question, I have examined the legislative history of Public Law 146, which authorized the United States to participate in the International Refugee Organization. I have also secured from the Department of State the latest available figures on the amounts contributed by various countries, including the United States, to the PCIRO.

In the light of this informaton, it is clear that the Congress never intended to limit the United States contribution to IRO, or PCIRO, to any particular percentage of the amount actually contributed by member governments at any given time. Obviously, if the United States happened to make the first contribution to IRO—even a token payment—this would represent 100 percent of the contributions received until other members made their contributions.

I find from the record that this question was first considered during the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution 77, a joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the IRO and authorizing an appropriation therefor. The Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, stated—page 10:

The United States has 39.89 percent of the administrative budget, and of the operational budget it has 45.75 percent. That, of course, is based on the theory that all these people will join. If they do not, then the percentage of those who join would be increased, because there would be fewer people.

On pages 43 and 44 of the same hearing, Assistant Secretary Hilldring stated as follows:

Our participation in the International Refugee Organization will involve a financial expenditure by the United States of $73,500,000 for the first year of operations. This sum is based on a contribution of 39.89 percent to the administrative budget ($1,915,000); or 45.75 percent to the operating budget ($69,110,000) and to the large-scale resettlement operations ($2,300,000); and the estimated cost of United States representation in the IRO ($175,000). It should be noted that contributions to large-scale resettlement may be on a voluntary basis; but we propose to contribute the same percent as for operational expenses. Since the percentages of contributions which I have mentioned are based on a full participation, the United States percentage of contribution would accordingly rise even though our total dollar expenditure would remain the same. If there is 85-percent participation, the United States contribution would amount to 54 percent of the total. At least 75 percent of the operational expenses must be contributed by 15 countries to bring the IRO into being. At that point the United States percent would be 61 percent. The estimated requirement of $73,500,000 was included in the Executive budget which has been submitted to the Congress by the President.

As the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] pointed out yesterday, the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations presented by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] further recognized this principle. The following appears in Report No. 51, dealing with the International Refugee Organization, on pages 2 and 3:

Participation in the International Refugee Organization would involve an expenditure by the United States of $73,500,000 for the first year of operations. This total is based on a contribution of 39.89 percent to the administrative budget ($1,915,000), 45.75 percent to the operating budget ($69,110,000), and to the large-scale resettlement operations ($2,300,000); and the estimated cost of United States representation in the International Refugee Organization ($175,000).

Those are the same figures which appeared in the previously quoted statement by Assistant Secretary Hildring.

Contributions to the large-scale resettlement program are on a voluntary basis. The percentages of contributions for the administrative and operating budgets are based on the assumption that all the members of the United Nations will participate in the work of the International Refugee Organization. Since some states are not expected to join, it follows that the percentage contribution of the United States will rise accordingly even though our total dollar expenditure will remain the same. Thus if there is 85-percent participation, for example, the United States contribution would amount to 54 percent of the total. In any event our contribution would remain at the $73,500,000 figure.

I will not burden the Senate with further quotations. I do wish to point out, however, that the question was also fully considered by the other body of Congress and that exactly the same interpretation was placed by it upon our Government's position as by the Senate. For the benefit of those who might wish to examine this in more detail, I would refer them to hearings before a special subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, first session, on House Joint Resolution 207, page 11; Report No. 464 of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, May 26, 1947, page 3; and hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, first session, on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1948, page 1508.

It is important to bear in mind that to the extent that there is less than full participation by all members of the United Nations in the International Refugee Organization, the percentage of contribution of every member government participating in and contributing to the IRO is necessarily higher than the percentage allotted to such government in annex II of the IRO constitution. For instance—and I am applying this to other countries—the percentage allotted in annex II to the United Kingdom is 14.75 percent, whereas the actual percentage of their contribution at present to PCIRO is 25 percent. Canada's present percentage is 6 percent, compared to the allotted percentage of 3.50 percent. Australia's actual present percentage is 4, in contrast to the 1.76 percent mentioned in annex II. Thus, it is clear that the percentages specified in annex II referred to the share of the provisional budget set forth in paragraph 1 of the annex, and not to any proportionate relationship among member governments, except in the unlikely event that all members of the United Nations simultaneously became paying members of the IRO.

On May 25, 1948, 14 governments had ratified the constitution of the IRO. That is 14 out of the required 15. Their contributions to the Preparatory Commission as of that date totaled $89,549,338. Of this total, the United States Government had contributed $53,268,674, or 59 percent of the total. That is, on May 25, 1948, the most recent date for which we have the figures. The figures are up to date. As other governments which have already ratified the constitution of IRO, such as Belgium and Argentina, and governments which are expected to ratify the constitution, such as Brazil, Venezuela, Denmark, and Sweden, make their contributions to IRO, the percentage which the United States contribution will bear to the total contributions will drop proportionately.

As of May 20, 1948, the member governments of IRO had contributed as follows—expressed in dollars. Mr. President, without reading the table, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the list of the nations participating and the exact amount which they have contributed up to this time, including, of course, the United States contribution of $53,268,674, which I mentioned before.

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

Austrialia	$2,753,225
Belgium	1,021,369
Canada	5,440,717
China	2,032,256
Dominican Republic	15,706
France	925,838
Guatemala	600
Iceland	8,033
Netherlands	377,880
New Zealand	688,666
Norway	183,910
United Kingdom	22,832,464
United States of America	53,268,674
Total	89,549,338

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for yielding to me.

Does the Senator from West Virginia wish to make any inquiry on this subject?

Mr. COOPER. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia for that purpose.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, as I followed the reasoning of the able Senator from New Jersey, it is that $73,500,000 was appropriated, that that sum should be spent, regardless of whether or not other countries contribute to what is known as the International Refugee Organization. If the thought and reasoning of my able friend from New Jersey were carried out, it would simply mean that, had the United States alone signed the international agreement, it would have had to contribute 100 percent of the PCIRO expenses, when the constitution itself expressly says that 39 percent is the limit to be paid by this country for administrative expenses, and 45 percent for operational expenses. I merely wish to make that point. I think we have both made our position clear, and I am willing that the RECORD stand with respect to the viewpoints which we have expressed.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator; and I thank the Senator from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, at a later time in the course of the debate upon this measure, in association with other Senators, I intend to propose an amendment to the bill relating to the question of administration. I had not intended to make any general statement upon the bill, but because of certain statements which have been made, and because of my own interest in this problem, I desire comment upon some of the facts which have prompted the formulation of the bill.

Three years have passed since the close of the war in Europe. Even before that time we had heard a great deal about displaced persons. It is rather surprising to note today, in the face of the great interest which has been expressed throughout the country in the

solution of this problem, that we have done little toward its solution.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am compelled to challenge in a most friendly way the statement that this country has done nothing about the problem.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure that our division will always be friendly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is estimated that by July 1 of this year 50,000 displaced persons will have entered the United States. I ask the Senator, What other country in the world has allowed that many to enter? Not one. I cannot agree with the statement of the Senator that we have done nothing to meet the problem.

Mr. COOPER. I hope the Senator will remember that I did not say that we had done nothing toward the solution of the problem. I said that we had done little toward its solution. I do not know that 50,000 have been admitted into the United States. It is my information that approximately 30,000 have been admitted. In proportion to our population and our resources, we have done less than have some other countries.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield, so that there may be no misunderstanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. My statement was that it was estimated that by July 1 of this year 50,000 will have entered. The Senator is correct as to the 30,000 who have already entered, up to some date in past months.

Mr. COOPER. I have been surprised by the misconceptions which are held concerning this problem. I realize, as was so well expressed by my good friend the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], that they have arisen in part from emotional attitudes toward the problem. Because of the fact that human beings are involved, and because of the circumstances which brought them into Germany and Austria, it is impossible to dissociate the human factor from the problem.

I compliment the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia for his leadership of the subcommittee. His subcommittee has done an admirable job in preparing for the benefit of the Senate a factual statement of the many aspects of the displaced-persons problem. I have not agreed with all the conclusions which may be drawn from the factual statement, but I believe that it is an accurate and fair statement of many facts concerned with this great question.

I do not have any special information which should be made available to the Senate; but as a member of the subcommittee which considered the problem, I shall state my views.

I do not want to bring into the debate a personal matter; but I think I should say that I believe that, with the exception of the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I have probably seen this problem at closer range than has any other Member of this body. It was because of that experience that my first interest in the people was aroused. It was aroused long before I became a Member of the Senate, and before I thought I would ever be a Member of this body.

In March 1944 I had the experience of entering Germany with the armies of the United States. For the first time we saw streaming back along the roads, at times almost closing the roads to the requirements of military travel, great numbers of displaced persons. I shall never forget one of the most dramatic and moving spectacles I have ever seen, that of thousands of men, women, and children, ill-clad, without adequate food, and without means of transportation, trudging along the roads, yet happy and joyful in their liberation.

At the close of the war I was assigned for a time in Munich as legal adviser to the officer in the Third United States Army, Maj. Philip Schaefer, who was charged with making arrangements for the repatriation of approximately 3,000,000 displaced persons in that zone. In that capacity I had the opportunity to see and hear some of the representatives of other nations who came there to make arrangements for the repatriations of their nationals, and I had the opportunity to visit many of the displaced persons' camps and talk with the occupants of those camps. For whatever it may be worth, I state these facts so that the Senate may know some of the reasons upon which I base the conclusions I have reached.

I think it would be worth while to make clear again to this body the groups of persons with whom we are concerned in the consideration of this problem.

There were some 8,000,000 persons who were actually displaced because of the war. As the Nazi armies swept across western Europe, Poland, and the Balkan States, and then into Russia, they tore thousands of such persons forcibly from their homes and from their farms and from their families, and drove them into Germany, there to work in their fields and factories, or, if they had political or religious influence, to be placed in the concentration camps at Buchenwald, Dachau, Flossenburg, Auschwitz, or the other places of horror about which we have heard.

Second, there is another group of persons who cannot properly be called, in the technical sense, displaced persons. They were residents of Germany and of Austria, but because of their political opposition to the Nazi regime or because of the fact that they were Jews upon whom had been imposed the hateful Nuremburg law, they were forced into the concentration camps. They were not displaced persons in the sense that they were taken from their homes in other countries, but they were displaced from their social and political and religious life in Germany.

There is a third group. In the closing days of the war there came sweeping back toward Germany, from the Baltic states—from Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—thousands of persons fleeing before the advance of the armies of one of our allies, Russia. I talked to many of those people—Latvians, Lithuanians, and Esthonians. They were people whose countries suffered two occupations. They were occupied by the Russian armies in the early days of the war. Later they were occupied by the German armies, as they moved into Russia. Those with whom I talked stated that the German occupation, bad as it was, did not compare in horror with the Russian occupation; thousands of these people fled from the Russian armies as they moved to join the United States armies in Germany. This group of persons constitutes a considerable part of the total number of displaced persons.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. During what years did such persons flee from the Baltic countries?

Mr. COOPER. The class of persons I am talking about fled from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the eastern part of Poland in the spring of 1945, before the Germans surrendered.

Mr. EASTLAND. These countries have immigration quotas. Have the displaced persons from those countries been coming into the United States each year under the quotas of those countries?

Mr. COOPER. These countries have very small quotas. I think the quotas amount to only a few hundred for each, whereas the total number of such persons in Germany and Austria is approximately 200,000.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, does not the bill provide that 50 percent of the 100,000 persons must come from those particular countries?

Mr. COOPER. The bill now before the Senate—the bill reported by the committee—does so provide.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield, if the Senator from Mississippi has finished.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am glad to have the Senator proceed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I simply wish to make a statement apropos of the point raised by the Senator from Mississippi. The bill provides that 50 percent of the quotas shall be available to the people who have suffered in the way the Senator has described, and who are, in truth, genuine displaced persons, and are persons whose lands have been annexed by another country.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. One of the reasons for that is that the people in the Baltic states and in the portion of Poland east of the Curzon line have had their lands taken from them, and they cannot return. So 50 percent of the quotas are set aside for their benefit. However, most of them have not been able to enter this country, because the quotas for their countries are so small, as compared with the quotas for larger countries. For that reason, we thought the provision was a fair one, in order that the persons whose plight has been so eloquently described by the Senator from Kentucky might have a chance to enter the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question at this point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I notice in the committee hearings a statement that 40 percent of the persons who have entered the United States have entered under forged documents.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, that is not quite correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. What is the fact?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Forty percent of the documents offered to our consuls abroad, in connection with the making of applications for visas for entrance into the United States, were found to be forged. It is not correct to say that the persons presenting those forged documents were admitted to the United States. Those persons were applying for visas to enter the United States under quotas under the Presidential directive of December 22, 1945, which gives a preference to displaced persons, under the quotas.

Very few of the people of the Baltic states could enter the United States under such an arrangement, because they had to come here under the small quotas which applied to their countries. On the other hand, Poland has a fairly large quota—more than 5,000.

The evidence in respect to 40 percent of the persons having forged documents applies to the supporting evidence and applications and other documents which had to be offered when persons applied for visas.

Mr. EASTLAND. The point I wish to make is that no system to screen the applicants is provided. There are no facilities to detect fraud or forgery.

Under the bill now pending, what is the system of screening which will be set up?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the bill there will be a commission which will prescribe rules and regulations. But actually the administration will be through the consular offices, just as is the case today. In other words, the displaced persons will enter the United States under visas, as all other immigrants do.

Mr. EASTLAND. How can it be determined whether their papers are forged or are genuine?

Mr. REVERCOMB. When the offices of the United States consulates are properly staffed with good investigators, such detections are made. It is in that way that any false documents are identified. As a matter of fact, I hope that in connection with the program under this bill the consulates will have more investigators and more competent staffs.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the bill contain any provision for improving the screening process?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. What is provided by the bill in that respect?

Mr. REVERCOMB. A complete investigation must be made. I shall be glad to read that part of the bill. Section 6 provides:

SEC. 6. No eligible displaced person shall be admitted into the United States unless there shall have first been a thorough investigation and written report made and prepared by such agency of the Government of the United States as the President shall designate, regarding such person's character, history, and eligibility under this act. The burden of proof shall be upon the person who seeks to establish his eligibility under this act.

And so forth.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is true that that provision is in the bill; but does the Senator from West Virginia think for one moment that because that provision is in the bill, a proper investigation will be made? Does the Senator think there will be adequate screening; or does he think that in the future, as has been the case in the past—and to be perfectly frank about the matter, we know that in the past the screening has been a joke——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, all of us know that all that can be undertaken by a legislative body is to make a declaration of the law and of the principles which shall apply. A legislative body has no power of enforcement.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The enforcement must be made by the administrative branch of the Government.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. But we should consider the power of enforcement, and we should consider whether it will be possible to enforce properly the provisions of the law, so as to attain the objectives we have in mind when we pass the law. In other words, if the law is not going to be properly enforced, that is another matter. If it is not going to be properly enforced it seem to me that is one of the reasons why the bill should not be enacted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I say to the able Senator that the bill declares very clearly that there shall be what is generally termed a screening; in other words, an investigation. Today that is being done through some of the consular offices. Of course, they should be better equipped. Today they have assigned to them, in some instances, men who have been trained in the work of investigation. Many of them have served in the Army of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield once more?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator from West Virginia think there has been in the past a proper investigation of applicants?

Mr. REVERCOMB. In some instances I doubt that there has been. That is my own view.

Mr. EASTLAND. What does the Senator think about screening and the system which has been used in the past?

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Senator wants my own impression, I think that in the past it has been rather lax.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator went to Europe and studied the question at first hand, did he not?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes, and I may say that in some of the offices I visited I became thoroughly convinced that the processes were tightening and that greater care is being exercised. With better equipment and increased personnel they are detecting the attempts wrongfully to obtain visas, and it was through such an investigation as that that the 40 percent of forged documents was found. I think if they can find 40 percent of forged documents, it indicates they are tightening up and applying a method of invesigation which seems to be worth while and which gets results to that extent at least.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think there has been a really bona fide attempt made in the past?

Mr. REVERCOMB. With respect to the consular offices?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is, an attempt to detect forged documents and to prevent black marketeers from coming into this country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to the Senator from Mississippi, I am convinced with respect to the consular offices I visited that there is a very earnest attempt being made at this time.

Mr. EASTLAND. But they do not have adequate facilities, do they?

Mr. REVERCOMB. They have facilities. I think they ought to be better staffed with investigators.

Mr. EASTLAND. But how are we going to remedy that situation by means of this bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is remedied by requiring it to be done, and it is then up to the administrative office to furnish the equipment with which to do it. That is their duty.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but there is no provision that would require them to do that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. The point is, if they are not going to do it, why should we pass this bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to the Senator I do not see how it could be more directly required than by the language of section 6 which I have just read.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator's hope is apparently very much more fervent than mine. Personally, I think it will be a task in the future, as it has been in the past. In certain quarters I do not think there is any desire to uphold the immigration laws of this country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, if that charge is correct, it is the fault of the administrators of the law.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am hopeful they will heed the law passed by Congress and will enforce it according to the directions of the law.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, commenting for a moment on questions which have been raised by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, it seems to me that if we prescribe definite standards and provide adequate and efficient administrative machinery, we cannot assume that the men who will be charged with responsibility under the act will not attempt to follow the dictates of the Congress.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator from Kentucky says is true. That is well and good. But if there is going to be no desire to enforce the law, I do not think we should pass it. That is the

point I make. The machinery is provided, but if there is not a desire that it be used and that the terms of the bill be enforced as contemplated by Congress, it does no good to vote for the bill. That is one of the reasons for my opposition to the bill.

Mr. COOPER. The bill provides that the members of the Commission must be approved by the Senate.

Resuming the statement I had begun a short time ago, I was attempting to name the groups which constitute the displaced-persons population in Germany, Austria, and Italy. I said one group was made up of people who had been displaced from countries of their own nationality; the second group was composed of persecutees in Germany, and a third group was composed of persons who fled from the Baltic states before the armies of our then ally, Russia. A fourth group came after the war from Poland and the Baltic states, as political or religious refugees.

The times and places at which the four groups found themselves in the category of displaced persons may differ, but all groups have common attributes. They are displaced persons because of force exercised by the Nazis, and they are displaced because of their political and religious beliefs. About 8,000,000 have been repatriated to their own countries. But more than a million remain in Germany, Austria, and Italy. About 850,000 of them are in the zones of the Allies, the United States, Great Britain, and France. So we are finally faced with this problem: What shall be done with these persons? What responsibility shall the United States assume? To what extent shall we assume responsibility, if we declare we do have responsibility?

Several courses could be taken with respect to these people. The first is that they could be repatriated forcibly to their own countries. Before the war closed, the United States had entered into an agreement with its Allies at Yalta that no national of the United Nations who was a displaced person in Europe would be forced to return to the country of his nationality against his will. There was one exception, an exception was made in the case of Russia. We agreed at Yalta that every Russian could be required to return to Russia. I remember that after the war closed, Russians were forced into boxcars and trucks under guard and were compelled against their will to return to Russia. I am sorry that this happened. I have heard it said several times upon the floor of the Senate that it is the tradition of America that we will not force a national to return to his country against his will. I do not say that in the instance mentioned we did so willingly; I know that it was done unwillingly; but I do know that for a time after the war we compelled Russians to return to Russia against their will.

Later, at Potsdam, it was agreed that we would accelerate the repatriation of displaced persons to Russia. Russia has continued to insist that her nationals and Baltic nationals should be required to return. I remember that upon one occasion a question arose concerning the spouses of Russians. During their several years' stay in Germany, many Russians had married displaced persons of other nationalities, French, Italian, Belgian, and Dutch, and the Russian representative said to us, "We will take our own people, but we will not take their wives. If they are women, we will not take their husbands. And we will not take their children." I am very happy to say that the problem was solved simply by refusing to send Russians back. Repatriation of such people against their will is not consistent with our traditions or consistent with the statements made so many times by our own Government, and even by our Representatives in Congress.

A second possibility would be to encourage settlement of displaced persons in Germany, to encourage Balts, Yugoslavs, and Poles to find a home there. It will be remembered that prior to the last war one of the main grounds upon which Germany based her case was overpopulation and the need for living room. Germany's area has been constricted, and at the same time its population has been increased by the entry of the volksdeutsche from Czechoslovakia. It would be very difficult from an economic standpoint to insist that hundreds of thousands of persons should be placed upon the economy of Germany. From a human standpoint, I do not believe we should require persons from other countries, who were brought into Germany against their will, and natives of Germany who have suffered indignities and persecution at the hands of their own Government to stay in the land which is responsible for their mistreatment. It is said that the American occupying forces are present and the people can have the assurance that so long as our forces are there the people will be protected. That is true. But I am sure that there arise day after day in the minds of these people doubts and fears about their status when our armies leave. I think that as a matter of decency it would be wrong to say to those people, "You must stay against your wishes in this land which is responsible for your condition."

A third possibility is that we continue to care for them in their camps. I shall not argue the question of expense. An enormous expense to this country would be involved. I agree with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the statement of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] that the stories which have been told about the treatment of displaced persons are untrue. They are receiving more food than the Germans are receiving. They are receiving adequate housing, and they are enjoying, as a whole, better living conditions than are the people of Germany or of Austria. But that is not sufficient. Whatever food, clothing, and housing they have, they cannot be expected to live under present conditions indefinitely and without hope. I think it is very timely to recall that fact to the minds of many people in the country who proclaim that economic welfare is the supreme objective of democracy in our country and in all other countries. The displaced persons are, from an economic standpoint, well cared for, but they are not happy or satisfied, because they are not free. It should be a good lesson to those who argue the supremacy of the theory of economic welfare.

The only alternative which is correct is resettlement. The countries which have subscribed to the IRO, with its prime objective of resettlement, should carry into principle and action their objective.

A few moments ago the Senator from West Virginia stated that there had already been brought to this country approximately 30,000 displaced persons under the President's directive of December 1945. That statement is true. I should like to say that other nations have also accepted displaced persons. Judging from the latest reports of IRO, approximately 115,000 have been resettled. Some countries have done more, in proportion to their populations and resources, than has the United States.

Objections have been made to the resettlement of displaced persons in America. I want to make it very clear that I agree that the admittance of displaced persons must be considered in the light of our own economic condition and our security. In the consideration of this bill we must keep in mind our ability to care for the displaced persons we admit.

On the other hand, I do not agree with many arguments which have been made against the admission of displaced persons. The first argument, and one most commonly used, is that the United States is not able to assimilate 100,000 displaced persons each year. When this debate started a few days ago it was pointed out that but for the war we would have received in this country, in the four war years, almost as many people as we are proposing to receive under an amendment which provides for 200,000 persons in 2 years. I point out, in answer to the argument made by my good friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, who fears that we may bring into this country more persons than can be provided with housing and employment, that according to the terms of the bill itself, no person could be brought here until housing and employment had been made certain.

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

Mr. COOPER. In a moment.

The figure of 100,000 a year is merely a ceiling. If employment and housing can be provided, we shall meet it. If employment and housing cannot be provided, only those persons will be admitted who can be provided with employment and housing.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator agrees that whatever number may be agreed upon by the Senate, it should be conditioned on whether America has employment and housing to take care of them?

Mr. COOPER. I think we must first take into consideration our own security. I should certainly make that an indispensable condition. I think also that we must take into consideration our own resources. But in considering our re-

sources I would say that we can make some sacrifice.

Mr. WILEY. I do not think my question was answered. My question was whether the Senator felt that as a condition precedent to whatever number of persons come in, there should be definite employment and housing for them.

Mr. COOPER. I think it would be best for the displaced persons themselves. I agree with the proposition advanced by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that whenever he takes the floor he makes a very cogent argument. I cannot disagree with much that he has said. I think, however, that if he will analyze his argument he will realize that it comes pretty close to an emotional appeal. I honor him for that. I sense definitely that this country owes an obligation to the displaced persons, and my thought is that if we can screen 50,000 the first year and can get the machinery put into operation effectively to do the job in accordance with the law, so that we shall not be holding out false promises for the admission of a larger number, we will in a way gear ourselves to the challenge which is included in taking care of more of them in the time ahead.

If the Senator will yield further——

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I merely wish to bring out this one thought, because it seemed to me that in the opening of the Senator's argument there was somewhat of an overstatement to the effect that nothing had been done in relation to this whole matter of displaced persons.

Mr. COOPER. Before the Senator makes an argument, will he permit me to correct him?

Mr. WILEY. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. If the Senator will remember what I said, he will recall that I did not make the statement that nothing had been done.

Mr. WILEY. Very little, the Senator said.

Mr. COOPER. I said very little had been done in comparison to that done by other countries of smaller population and poorer resources. I stand upon that statement.

Mr. WILEY. I accept the amendment, and I wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that he said that at the end of the war there were 8,000,000 people included in this category, and that there are now virtually only 1,300,000 who would be characterized as displaced persons.

I call his attention to page 23 of the record produced by the Committee on the Judiciary showing that up to January 1 apparently out of this number 133,000 had been resettled in countries from Argentina to Venezuela, and including the United States, and that the figure in the United States was only 29,000, whereas we now understand that by July 1 we will have absorbed 50,000 of these displaced persons.

The only point I wish to make is that I think that giving Europe $30,000,000,000, seeing to it that her displaced persons are better off, as the Senator has said, than the Germans and the people outside of displaced-persons camps, having resettled approximately 150,000, and having reduced the total number from 8,000,000 down to 1,300,000, it seems to me indicates that a pretty good job has been done.

I do not wish to discount what has been done, nor do I say that is a sufficient answer to what we should do. I think the challenge is present, and I agree with the Senator that we are attempting to meet the challenge practically alone. We are not doing this in conjunction with other nations. Whatever we are doing, we are doing it under our own statutory enactment. We are not proceeding under IRO, we are proceeding by another individual effort of our country. So let us not discount the great efforts of our great country too much, when we are about the only people in the world who are doing things.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator for his very kind remarks. I shall always appreciate the tremendous sacrifices being made by our people in every field. I reply, first, that if my statement has seemed to him to be based upon emotion, I am sorry, because I did not intend it to be. I will add, however, that the human element is implicit in the problem. It certainly would appeal to the conscience of this country to take whatever steps it could reasonably take to meet the problem. To that extent, I shall not discount even the human side of the problem.

I stated a few minutes ago that the argument had been made that we should not take 200,000 displaced persons because we could not assimilate them. I answer that by saying that the bill itself provides that they cannot enter the United States until housing and employment have been furnished, and that any figure fixed is merely a ceiling. If housing and employment can be furnished, that ceiling will be reached; if they are not provided, it will not be reached.

A second argument which has been made against the admission of these persons is that they are not the type we should permit to enter this country. I was very much interested in hearing the Senator from Wisconsin say in his speech that when he visited the displaced persons camps he found the inmates working, clean, happy, joyful, and creative. I think that if we read the record made by the committee we will find that the same conclusion was reached by the committee.

The reports of the International Refugee Organization indicate that these people have been able to maintain their family groups, even in the camps. The fact that they have held to their family groups, are engaging in such employment as is available, and their ability to hold morale during the years, indicate that they have stability of character.

I do not believe such stability would be harmful if assimilated in our own country.

Perhaps the argument which stirs the greater number of people is the statement that the entrance of these people would permit the infiltration of subversive elements. I say again that an indispensable condition is the security of this country must be protected. It can be protected by proper safeguards as to investigation, and screening safeguards which have been provided in the bill. Let us look to the character of the people, and consider why they are displaced persons. Two hundred thousand are Balts who fled before the advance of the Russian Army because they did not want to live under Communist domination.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator spoke of the conduct of the Russian soldiers. What was their conduct?

Mr. COOPER. I do not think it is particularly relevant to this argument, but if the Senator asks me to state what I was told, I shall be glad to do so.

I talked to occupants of the displaced persons camps of the Baltic nations. They told the same story, a story that was presented orally and in the form of memorials or petitions which came to the American military authorities. That story was that after these countries had been overrun by the Russian armies in the early days of the war their leadership was exterminated; within a short time the leaders of the church, the political leaders, and the so-called intelligentsia, professors, teachers, and artists were purged. They stated that provisional governments were formed, and that there were placed at the head of the provisional governments persons who were the tools of the Russian occupying forces. In a short time democratic government, as we understand it, and freedom and liberty disappeared. When they saw that a second occupation by the Russian forces was imminent they fled into Germany.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have read in the New York Times articles charging that Russian agents were in those camps. Did the Senator secure any such information when he was in Europe?

Mr. COOPER. I have no information to that effect, and I think a study of the committee's report does not support the statement. I have referred to the Baltic people, that among those displaced persons are Poles who also fled before the advance of the Russian Army.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. There are Yugoslavs who cannot go back to Yugoslavia because they are not willing to live in Yugoslavia under the regime of Tito.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I notice in the State Department report on the Marshall plan the statement that there exists a shortage of labor in Europe, and that if the Marshall plan industries are set up as contemplated in the plan there will be a shortage of more than 600,000 workers. Is there any reason why displaced workers should not stay in Europe and become part of the life there and take their place

in the economy which is being established there?

Mr. COOPER. If they willingly do so there is certainly no reason, but if they do not desire to do so because of the fact that they were drawn by force into Germany or Austria, or because of the fact that they were residents of those countries and became persecutees, then I think I can understand their unwillingness to remain there.

Mr. EASTLAND. If there is a place for them in Europe, if there is a need for them in Europe, why should we take them into this country?

Mr. COOPER. I think the Senator's question expresses a very hopeful opinion, because if such opportunities are made available there, aided and supplemented by the admission of some of these persons into other countries, we could solve the entire displaced persons problem.

Mr. EASTLAND. Figures of European governments show that there is a great need for more than 600,000 workers in Europe. Why is it that they cannot stay there and work and rebuild the devastated cities of that continent?

Mr. COOPER. They can if they desire, but we have been pointing out all along that we cannot force them to stay.

Mr. EASTLAND. If they do not desire to stay there and work, why should we take them into the United States?

Mr. COOPER. I have tried to point out to the distinguished Senator in my argument that many of these people were uprooted from their homes and caused by force to go into Germany or Austria and others were political or religious persecutees in Germany or Austria.

Mr. EASTLAND. They do not have to go back to the countries behind the iron curtain. The countries I speak of are under the Marshall plan, and under the Marshall plan there exists a shortage of 600,000 workers. If these people do not want to work, do we want them in our country?

Mr. COOPER. I do not think we can base the proposition upon the ground that they do not want to work. I think there is a fundamental difference between our viewpoints upon this problem. The Senator's argument is in effect that we will force them to stay there even against their will. We cannot make of them freed laborers. They came into Germany as free laborers. My position is that they have valid grounds for not wishing to stay in a country which is responsible for their condition.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator mean, to stay in Germany?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. What about other countries in Europe where a labor shortage exists?

Mr. COOPER. Other countries are now taking displaced persons for work, notably Great Britain, Belgium, France, and if we will take a fair share it is probable that the entire problem can be solved.

Mr. EASTLAND. We are giving to the Marshall plan countries aid and assistance to the tune of $17,000,000,000. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky that there are many good people in the camps in Europe, but there is a grave shortage of labor in Europe. Figures furnished by the Marshall plan countries show that those countries need some of the displaced persons as workers. As one illustration, France is importing a great number of laborers from Italy and from other countries. The need for workers is as great as there are refugees in the camps. If they do not want to go to another country to work, if they do not want to become a part of the peoples of Europe, what obligation is there upon us to take them into the United States?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is assuming that all the 1,200,000 displaced persons in the three countries, or the 850,000 which are in the western zones, will find occupation and employment in Europe. I cannot agree that that assumption is correct. I do not believe the Senator can assume that it is true. I am simply saying that if we take 200,000 and lead the way it will give hope and promise that perhaps the remainder of the displaced persons can be resettled in other countries in Europe or throughout the world.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator speaks of 200,000. Is the Senator opposed to the bill?

Mr. COOPER. The bill proposes 100,000. I have joined with several other Senators, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in offering an amendment to the bill to permit the entry of 200,000 persons.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator said, "If we will lead the way." How many refugees have come into the United States since 1933?

Mr. COOPER. According to the reports, I believe 30,000 displaced persons have entered the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Since 1933?

Mr. COOPER. Oh, since 1933—I do not know about that. I say 30,000 displaced person have entered the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. A refugee is a displaced person.

Mr. COOPER. I do not agree with that statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. Some of them are displaced persons.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; some refugees are displaced persons.

Mr. EASTLAND. Very well. Now, how many have we taken into this country since 1933?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know.

Mr. EASTLAND. We have taken in hundreds of thousands. How can the Senator say that we should lead the way and imply that we are not doing our part when we have taken into our country more than all the other countries combined have admitted.

Mr. COOPER. We can confuse this question by general statements. The Senator said that since 1933 we have taken in hundreds of thousands of refugees.

Mr. EASTLAND. We have.

Mr. COOPER. Have we not taken them under our immigration quotas and under law?

Mr. EASTLAND. Some of them, yes.

Mr. COOPER. Have we taken any outside our immigration quotas?

Mr. EASTLAND. Thousands and thousands.

Mr. COOPER. Who are they?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator would not tell the Senate, would he, that thousands and thousands do not enter this country illegally every year?

Mr. COOPER. I have no knowledge of that fact. I have heard it stated again and again. We know that quota and nonquota immigrants come into this country. We know that persons come into this country as visitors and as students. I assume there are some who enter illegally. But I have no information as to the thousands that have come in illegally.

Mr. EASTLAND. I can tell the Senator that students and other nonquota immigrants have come into this country. Thousands and thousands of them have come here.

Mr. COOPER. Students and visitors are permitted by law, but my information to the number is probably as general as I believe the Senator's information is.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is mistaken. I am going to give the figures later in the debate which I hope will convert the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. I shall be glad to hear the figures.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The question being discussed by the Senator is very interesting. I have certain figures which might answer some of the questions which have been raised in this discussion.

In the past 7 years 1,111,244 nonimmigrants arrived in this country. During the same period 843,957 nonimmigrants departed from this country, leaving a difference in the country of 267,287, who apparently are still here, unless they have died. Those are nonimmigrants—visitors, treaty merchants, and such others as may come. It would seem from those figures, by a process of simple arithmetic, that certainly a substantial portion of the 267,287 are still in this country illegally.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement, but it is a general statement. All the Senator has said is that nonimmigrants are in this country. He has not said that they are here illegally. Will he say so?

Mr. REVERCOMB. They are visitors, and they have not left the country.

Mr. COOPER. But will the Senator say that they are here illegally?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. Those who have come here for a limited visit, and whose time has not been extended, but who have remained beyond the time they were supposed to visit in the country, certainly are here illegally.

Mr. COOPER. I do not agree with that conclusion. I understood the Senator to say that there were about 267,000 nonimmigrants in the country. I ask

the Senator, how many of the 267,000 are here illegally, having overstayed the period of time for which they were admitted to this country?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Certainly a very substantial number of them.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Senator know that to be true of a single one of them?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Certainly. It is fair to deduce that many thousands of them are here illegally. These figures are furnished by the Immigration Bureau itself. Furthermore, with respect to the displaced persons, a proposed substitute to be offered, providing that approximately 15,000 in that category be permitted to stay in this country. They came in as nonimmigrants. Can the Senator see any reason for a substitute of that nature unless there are some here illegally?

Mr. COOPER. I do not favor the substitute, because I believe that a displaced person should come in under the provisions of law which we establish. I do not follow the Senator's argument, because the 15,000 displaced persons in this country may well have entered under permits. Is the Senator able to say that they are here illegally?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course they entered under permits, and of course they are here as visitors. So long as a visitor's permit continues, he is here legally. But the point I am getting at is this: Are the 15,000 displaced persons who have come here as visitors to be given permanent residence?

Mr. COOPER. I do not agree that they should be.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to hear the Senator say that, because they ought to be kept within the displaced persons category.

Mr. COOPER. I agree entirely.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let us go back to the original figure. Can the able Senator escape the conclusion that if during the course of the past 7 years 1,111,244 came in, and 843,957 left the country, and 267,287 remained, a substantial number are here illegally?

Mr. COOPER. I have no doubt that included in that number are persons who are not here legally; but I cannot say whether the number is 100, 100,000, or 10,000. When the Senator makes the statement that 267,287 nonimmigrants are in this country, we cannot draw from that statement any definite conclusion that all of them or any number are here illegally.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not say that all of them are here illegally. Some may have died during the course of their visit.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from West Virginia a question?

Mr. COOPER. I agree absolutely with the Senator from West Virginia that no person who is in this country illegally ought to be permitted to remain. I think those in that category should be deported. I do not believe in any evasion of law.

Secondly, I do not believe that the 15,000 displaced persons now in this country should be given permanent residence under special dispensation. They should be placed upon the same basis as all others who come in under permits. When their time expires they should be returned. Then if they can qualify under a displaced persons bill, let them come. I do not believe that there should be any evasion of the law, either directly or indirectly, at any time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The only value in discussing these figures is to show how many are here, so that we can then arrive at some conclusion as to how many ought to be allowed to come in.

Mr. COOPER. I think the discussion has value.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The able Senator heard the discussion the other day, when it was said that 336,000 nonimmigrants—that is, visitors—came into this country last year. That is 60 percent more than ever came in in any previous year. We can use those figures in arriving at the correct figure under this bill.

Mr. COOPER. I know that the Senator is the chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not know of anyone who knows more about immigration law than does the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. But I am sure he will agree with me that if these people have come into this country as nonimmigrants they came under statutes enacted by the Congress. There is nothing wrong in their being here legally under the statutes. The only wrong is that if they stay here longer than the period for which they were admitted then they are here illegally.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Certainly, there is no wrong in their coming here and remaining here in accordance with a statute. However, I am saying again that these figures throw light on the number who are remaining here illegally. We must use those figures when we arrive at a conclusion as to the provisions of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I do not believe that any figures should be used except figures as to those who are here illegally. Those who are here legally are here because we permitted them to come here legally.

Mr. President, I wish to hasten along and conclude my argument.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the Senator from West Virginia a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from West Virginia stated that 260,000 more aliens had come into this country than had gone out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No. The statement is that there remain in the country 267,287 nonimmigrants. Those are people who do not even come under the quotas. We arrive at that figure by deducting from the number who have come in as nonimmigrants the number who have departed.

Mr. EASTLAND. The point I am making is that those who have come into this country legally, as nonquota immigrants——

Mr. REVERCOMB. They are nonimmigrants, not nonquota immigrants. The nonimmigrants represent a third category.

Mr. EASTLAND. Whatever the category, it does not include those who came into this country illegally.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; it does not.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has investigated the entire subject. What is the Senator's information as to the number who have illegally entered the country, in addition to the 268,287 of whom the Senator spoke?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have no figures, and the immigration authorities cannot furnish figures, as to the number who have entered illegally. They do not know.

Mr. EASTLAND. What information did they give the Senator?

Mr. REVERCOMB. They have given us the information that they are approximately 150,000 cases behind in their investigations as to whether or not certain persons are here legally.

Mr. EASTLAND. Those represent only the cases with respect to which they have received information. They are 150,000 cases behind.

Mr. REVERCOMB. They are investigating them to see whether or not they are here illegally. We are advised by the immigration authorities that in New York City alone they are 32,000 cases behind in their investigations.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the Senator from West Virginia a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. How many nonquota immigrants came in last year?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Seventy-six thousand nonquota immigrants came in. The Senator understands that there are three categories, namely, quota immigrants, nonquota immigrants, and nonimmigrants. Seventy-six thousand nonquota immigrants came in last year.

Mr. McMAHON. How many displaced persons came in?

Mr. REVERCOMB. We do not know that.

Mr. McMAHON. I was told the other day that the displaced persons who did not come in under the quota numbered only in the hundreds.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not advised as to the number. I have no breakdown as between nonquota immigrants, displaced persons, and other immigrants.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have talked too long. I hasten to conclude.

In the time in which I have addressed the Senate I have tried to point out the groups of persons who may be classified as displaced persons, and some of their characteristics. In view of the action we already have taken in this field, we should take the further action which is now proposed. We became adherents to the International Refugee Organization, whose sole objective was the resettlement of refugees, among whom are included the displaced persons. It is my opinion that unless we act in this connection, our adherence to that organization will be absolutely meaningless. The committee which, under the resolution, was appointed to make an investigation of this problem and to report to the Senate, has

taken a position which, it seems to me, demands action. Despite all the criticism which has been leveled against the committee—it is clear that the committee has laid down some fundamental propositions or principles. The first is that we should solve this problem by resettlement. This is the first time such a decision has been made by any legislative group in this country.

In the second place, the committee has laid down the proposition that the families of workers should be admitted with the workers. Other countries have taken workers, but usually have not taken their families.

A great many persons have overlooked the fundamental principles which are laid down in the bill prepared by the subcommittee under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

I have disagreed with some of the details of the bill; and I have joined with some of my colleagues in offering certain amendments. We believe, first, that 200,000 persons should be admitted in 2 years.

In the second place, we believe priority should not be given to a particular group of these unfortunate people, but that the total number to be admitted should be decided, and then apportionment should be made as between the various groups, in the proportion that their number bears to the total number of displaced persons.

In the third place, we would extend until April 22, 1945, the time in which these people can be considered as displaced persons. It was on April 22, 1945, that the camps were closed by General Clay to further entrance by displaced persons.

In the fourth place, we believe that the administrative machinery provided by the bill is not adequate to meet the needs and objectives of the bill, and to carry out the full task of selection, transportation, and resettlement.

I believe it is our responsibility to help solve this problem. I am happy to join with those who believe that it is our responsibility. I hope the Congress will take action promptly, and that we will confirm our practical responsibility and our humanitarian and Christian tradition.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 110, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

CLYDE M. REED,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
ED C. JOHNSON,
FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
CARL HINSHAW,
LEONARD W. HALL,
CLARENCE F. LEA,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was about to make the same request.

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I realize that day before yesterday the Senator from Kansas announced he would seek to take up the conference report today. I realize it is a privileged matter. I do not see that there is any virtue in taking it up one day as against another, because it is privileged and can be brought up. Unfortunately one of the Members of the Senate who was very active in the consideration of the bill when it was before the Senate and who offered and secured the adoption of important amendments to it, is absent today. He will be here tomorrow. I hope the Senator from Kansas will agree not to press the conference report today, because it will be just as privileged tomorrow as it is today. I do not see any point in trying to force its consideration today. I think time will be saved by letting it go over until tomorrow. Frequently, Members of the Senate announce their intention or desire to take up a certain matter on a certain day, and when the time comes there are conditions which justify its going over for a day. There would be no inconsistency, as I see it, between the announcement of the Senator from Kansas, day before yesterday, and an agreement that the report might go over until tomorrow. I hope the Senator will not object, but will let that action take place.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I always like to accommodate my colleagues in the Senate. I thought that 48 hours notice, which I had given to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who was the leader of the opposition to the bill generally, would be satisfactory. I did not know anything about the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] being absent. It is true that he was active in the first consideration of the bill.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest, in view of the fact that we are hard pressed for time, if the distinguished Senator from Kansas will permit the conference report to go over until tomorrow, I am satisfied it will expedite matters considerably. I urge him to do that, in view of the statements which have been made by the minority leader. However, the Senator from Kansas did serve notice to the Senate. I am sure it will be taken in the proper spirit when I say that if the Senate is to expedite the program for the remainder of the session it will be necessary for Senators to be on the floor and to be ready at any time to consider important measures.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator's statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to make an announcement with regard to the importance of Senators being on the floor at all times, on both sides of the aisle. We have a program which we can complete without any difficulty or question by the 19th of June. I have been promised cooperation from both sides of the aisle in completing the program. I suggest that if the distinguished Senator from Kansas will accede to the request of the minority leader, it would help the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] who is necessarily absent and who would like to discuss some amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that I am not making any unreasonable request. No time will be lost. There is no virtue in action today as against action tomorrow. The Senator from Wyoming, who is unavoidably absent, took a prominent part in the debate and secured the adoption of what he thought were important and vital amendments.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, last year, when the bill was passed, it had been before the Senate and subject to debate for 5 days, when action should have been completed in 5 hours or less. If we are likely to run into a situation of that kind, I should like to get the conference report considered and disposed of as soon as possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield, I do not think there will be any such prolonged discussion on the conference report as was indulged in on the bill itself. I do not know how long the discussion will take, but I certainly should not think it would take very much time. I see no reason why it cannot be disposed of tomorrow.

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

Mr. REED. May we have an understanding, possibly through a unanimous-consent request, that debate be limited? So far as the proponents are concerned, they can say their say in less than an hour. If the opponents do not require more than 2 hours——

Mr. BARKLEY. Personally, I do not expect to occupy much time, not more than 15 or 20 minutes.

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

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no intention of speaking at any great length on the conference report. The bill comes to us drastically changed, and I desire to point out some of its dangers. The bill is of great consequence to the people of my State, but I think that perhaps 15 or 20 minutes will be all that I shall require.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think we can dispose of the conference report tomorrow within a reasonable time. We are all trying our best to cooperate and to facilitate the completion of the work of this session of Congress in order to adjourn on the 19th of June. If we had to recess during the Republican Convention and come back between the two conventions and recess again, there would be nothing but politics discussed in the Senate during that time. I am anxious that we conclude our work and relieve the country of our presence here.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Kansas that I am a member of the conference committee. I am present today, having canceled an engagement in order to be present. I have an engagement tomorrow which will put me in the same position tomorrow afternoon as that which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming occupies today. I shall not object to postponement of consideration of the conference report, but I agree with the acting majority leader, the Senator from Nebraska, that the thing to do is to stay on the job, so far as we can. When we endeavor to adjust matters after a program has been established, we are likely to change the whole plan.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that it is impossible to have every Member present every day. We all take liberties in leaving the Senate whenever it suits our convenience. There is no rule by which we can compel Senators to be present. There are occasions when a Senator is justified in departing for a day. I should not ask this concession except for the fact that the Senator from Wyoming was one of the outstanding Senators who participated in the debate on the bill and who secured the adoption of important and vital amendments.

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

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, who is a member of the conference committee, that he is here to discuss the conference report this afternoon, and in view of the statement made by the minority leader, I now ask unanimous consent that the hour of 2 o'clock on Friday next be set for the consideration of the conference report, that a vote be had at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, that the time be equally divided between the proponents and opponents, and that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] be in charge of the division of the time allotted to the proponents, and the minority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] be in charge of the division of the time allotted to the opponents.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are talking about beginning the consideration at 2 o'clock and voting at 4 o'clock. That is subject to roll-calls and other things that might interfere.

Mr. WHERRY. It is a conference report. There will be no amendments offered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that. But why not take up the report at 1 o'clock?

Mr. WHERRY. The only way we can propose a unanimous-consent request is to try to start with something. I shall be glad to suggest that the report be taken up at noon and the vote be had at 2 or 3 o'clock, if that is satisfactory. But I think, in view of the fact that we are asking the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] to vacate an order which was made, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is present and cannot be present tomorrow, and that we are asked to accommodate the minority leader in his request, an hour should be fixed at which time the Senate can debate and vote the report up or down, at the convenience of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. We can take it up when the Senate meets on Friday, and can vote at 3 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I renew the request that when the Senate convenes on Friday at noon——

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall have to consult other Members with reference to it. The Senator does not need to be impatient about it.

Mr. WHERRY. I am never impatient.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator shook his head rather impatiently.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the time allowed for debate will be an hour and a half to each side?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. There have been statements in the press and it has been broadly hinted on the floor that Senators from Southern States, usually referred to as Southern Democrats, for ulterior reasons have delayed action on matters of legislation and have slowed down the work of the Senate. That charge is false. The RECORD will show that we have cooperated with the Republican leadership in every possible manner to expedite the business of this body. It is true we live under a cloud and are subjected to daily threats of all kinds of legislation which is most offensive to us. We are threatened with legislative riders of all kinds if we attempt to function as Senators. Nevertheless, we have cooperated in transacting the business of the Senate and of the country though we shall, of course, oppose all sectional legislation to the limit of our strength and ability.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I assure the distinguished Senator that any remarks of that kind did not come from me, and I wish to say for the RECORD that I could not ask for finer cooperation in the legislative program than we have had from those on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate that statement, and I am glad to state that in my opinion the Senator from Nebraska has done a perfectly magnificent job in expediting the business of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have read about the Senate being hopelessly involved in a log jam of legislation, but though I sit on this side of the aisle, I wish to say that during this session the legislative program has been expedited as well as I have ever seen done during my service in the Senate. There has been as little time wasted as I have ever seen. The program has been exceedingly well handled. We have made fine progress on the floor and in the important work of the committees.

Mr. WHERRY. I again thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. With that preliminary statement, Mr. President, I may say that I think that those opposed to the conference report bill ought to have a bit more than 1½ hours, because of the fact that the bill affects a number of States, and even though the cause may be hopeless, due to the fact that the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Kansas seem to have the votes, whether the Senator from New Jersey is here or not, we should like to state for the RECORD, briefly, at least, our reasons for opposing the conference report, and we will hope to have an opportunity to vote on it again after a Presidential veto. We shall make every effort to sustain the veto of this bill which we have reason to hope the Chief Executive will exercise when it is presented to him.

Mr. WHERRY. I amend the unanimous-consent request, and ask that

when the Senate convenes at noon Friday the conference report be laid down for the immediate consideration of the Senate, that a vote be had at 3 o'clock, that 1 hour be allowed to the proponents of the measure and 2 hours to the opponents, the time of the proponents be in charge of the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the time for the opponents in charge of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I say to the distinguished minority leader that I propose this order not impatiently, but with a great deal of optimism that he will accept the proposal.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have already announced that it is acceptable to me; but there are other Senators involved in the matter, and after conference I express the hope that the proposal may be agreeable. I hope I did not do the Senator an injustice when I described the shake of his head. Being familiar with cattle as he is, he knows that when an animal shakes his head in a certain manner, in the barnyard or in the field, it shows there is opposition indicated, and if I attributed to the Senator qualities of the steer, I apologize.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say, in reply, that he would better watch the animal's heels and not their heads.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I know one or two Senators who are not present today who would like to say something on the conference report. If the Senator from Nebraska will make the hour 3:30 o'clock and give us 2½ hours, I will agree.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to cooperate in every way possible. The Senator from Kentucky has suggested that roll calls and other business may intervene, so that if we meet at 12 o'clock it may take 15 minutes to get a quorum. So allowing 2½ hours would not mean that we would get 2½ hours. In other words, if it takes 10 or 15 minutes in order to get a quorum, we will not have that much time.

Mr. WHERRY. I will guarantee that the Senators will get the full time, and the quorum call can be had exactly at 3:30 o'clock.

Mr. HILL. I am speaking about the roll call when the Senate meets.

Mr. WHERRY. That will be charged to the proponents and opponents of the motion, if both sides agree that they would like to have a quorum call.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have to take into consideration the fact that any Senator can make a point of no quorum at any time.

Mr. WHERRY. The time would be charged to both sides in the same proportion.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I will submit the unanimous-consent request again, and change the time. I include the same provisions, with the exception that the time for the vote will be 3:30, and that 1 hour be allotted to the proponents and 2½ hours to the opponents, to be controlled as I have suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, May 28, 1948, at the hour of 12 o'clock noon, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, and that at the hour of 3:30 o'clock on said day a vote be taken on the question of agreeing to the report.

Ordered further, That of the intervening time 1 hour be allotted to those favoring the conference report, to be controlled by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and 2½ hours be allotted to those opposing the said report, to be controlled by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

BROADENING OF SOCIAL-SECURITY COVERAGE

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the pending business has been interrupted with the discussion to which we have listened, and which we have enjoyed. At this time I wish to speak very briefly on a subject which does not have any connection with the pending order of business.

Mr. President, Congress has been asked by the President of the United States to broaden the social-security laws. Although it seems to me this request is a strangely belated one, I am happy that upon this subject I find common ground of agreement with the Chief Executive. In fact, two of the basic changes which we are asked to make are almost duplications of the expansion of benefits I proposed more than 3 months ago in a bill which I introduced, Senate bill 2269.

Among other things, the President finally has seen fit to suggest that we consider the lowering of the age for social-security retirement pensions, but he suggests it for women only, and that the age be lowered from 65 to 60 for women.

It is my proposal, as set forth in Senate bill 2269, that lowering of the age for retirement benefits should not be extended to women alone, but that pensions should be made available to both men and women workers who have reached the age of 60, many of them after experiencing long years of arduous employment.

My bill includes another proposal, which I consider to be of major importance. My bill would provide payment of insurance benefits in the event a worker is totally disabled by injury or disease. It will be noted that the message from the President has included this request in his version of the proposed changes in the law.

Experience in the administration of the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act has shown that the law must be made more flexible if it is to provide real insurance against destitution for all persons it covers. There has been a steadily increasing demand from individuals, and from employers and labor from all sections of the United States, that the present retirement age of 65 be reduced to provide for cases of early superannuation.

I can see no valid reason why the lowering of the age should be confined to women. Certainly it is difficult for women to hold employment or obtain new jobs in their later years, but the age of 60 for men, in many cases, finds them worn and spent after a lifetime of toil.

It is significant, I think, that the much discussed pension plan for the coal miners, who number around 100,000 in my own State, has tentatively set the retirement age at 62.

I have said before, and I repeat, that while many workers are capable of continuing work past the age of 60, or even 65, there are others less sturdy who may be unable at a much lower age to hold onto a job or to find a new one.

A coal miner, a steel worker, or a timber cutter at 60 usually does not have the agility or the strength required to perform his full share of the work. A man of that age deserves the right to cease laboring, and spend the rest of his time in comfortable living.

Mr. President, there is nothing in S. 2269 which would make retirement mandatory at 60, but it would allow those who desire to stop work to do so. About 900,000 older men and women at the present time have retired and are drawing benefits. If the age is lowered to 60, almost a million more would be eligible immediately for old-age pensions.

I might say that not all of these would hasten to give up their jobs. At the present time, I am advised, about 925,000 men and women are eligible for immediate payments, but they have not filed applications. This is because they prefer to stay at their jobs as long as they are able. Almost every American, if he has an opportunity, would rather work and gain substantial earnings; would rather "work out than rust out."

This lowering of the general retirement age is one way of making our social-insurance system flexible enough to meet the basic needs of its members.

But I think the second, and by far the most important change needed, is the provision of insurance benefits for workers who are totally disabled by disease or accidents at ages under 60. Crippling diseases and accidents respect no age.

Most cases of heart disease and arthritis attack men before they reach the age of 65. As a matter of fact, statistics show the onset of about half of all cases of total disability occurs before that age.

The worker who becomes disabled in middle or early life needs insurance benefits at least as much as does the worker who has been retired from employment because of age.

I wonder how many of us actually take time to try to understand what it means in terms of heartbreak, sacrifice, and poverty to have a husband or young father become totally unable to work. Income stops. Sometimes the employer continues the weekly check for a few payments, but eventually that sort of charity comes to an end. There are doctor bills. Perhaps there are expensive drugs to buy, such as streptomycin for tuberculosis, which costs several hundred dollars for full treatment.

To illustrate the effect of prolonged disability on old-age and survivors' insurance rights, let us take as an example the case of a newspaper linotype operator who became permanently disabled in March of this year at the age of 52. This particular individual entered covered employment in April 1939, at the

time he sold his own printing shop to take the job he held until recently.

His earnings averaged $200 per month for the 9 years he worked for wages and he has paid $216 as his share of the social-security taxes. If this man continued to work at the same wage rate until 1961 when he would reach age 65, he would be eligible for a benefit of $40.71, and his wife at 65 would draw an additional $20.20.

However, since disability prevents his ever meeting the full insured status requirements for retirement benefits, I am advised there will be no return on his money if he lives to be 65 or over. Every cent he has paid into the social-security fund will be lost.

The example I have cited is not an isolated case. There are thousands of them. Disability is the chief single case of poverty and dependency in our Nation. At any one time about 1,600,000 members of the civilian labor force have been disabled for 6 months or more, and approximately 1,000,000 of them have been disabled for longer than a year. It is estimated that during 1947 workers lost a billion or more workdays because of a permanent disability.

The loss of wages and the costs that come with disablement result in widespread dependence on public aid. Even in a year of high employment like 1947, the public assistance costs resulting from disability borne by States, municipalities, and the Federal Government are enormous.

The cost of a disability insurance program are extremely small when measured against the gains in security it would provide for men, women, and children throughout the entire Nation.

An extended disability insurance program would eliminate the certain liquidation of family income and resources which now occurs when this hazard strikes; it would help keep families together and would permit mothers to remain at home to care for their children instead of being forced into outside employment; it would remove the stigma and humiliation of having to accept relief; it would substantially reduce the assistance costs of local units of government; and it would preserve the old-age and survivors' insurance rights of insured workers.

Mr. President, this is a subject in which I have been long interested, and which has long appealed to me. I am hopeful that the Senate will give early, careful, and favorable consideration to the bill I have introduced, Senate bill 2269.

I ask that the bill to which I referred in my remarks on old age pensions be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill S. 2269 to amend title II of the Social Security Act in order to reduce the qualifying age for old-age and survivors insurance benefits to 60 and broaden the old-age and survivors' insurance system to include benefits on account of disability, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Extended Disability Insurance Amendments of 1948."

AGE OF BENEFICIARIES LOWERED

SEC. 2. (a) Clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 202 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "sixty-five" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixty."

(b) Effective only with respect to applications filed prior to July 1, 1949, and after the end of the third calendar month which begins after enactment of this act, clause (A) of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of such section 202 is amended to read as follows: "(A) has attained the age of sixty."

(c) Clause (B) of paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of such section 202 is amended by striking out "sixty-five" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixty."

(d) Clause (A) of paragraph (1) of subsection (f) of such section 202 is amended by striking out "sixty-five" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixty."

(e) Paragraph (1) of subsection (g) of section 209 of such act is amended by striking out "sixty-five" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixty."

(f) The amendments made by subsections (a), (c), (d), and (e) of this section shall be applicable only in cases of applications for benefits filed under title II of the Social Security Act after the end of the third calendar month which begins after the enactment of this act.

BENEFITS ON ACCOUNT OF TOTAL DISABILITY

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 202 of the Social Security Act (as amended by section 2 of this act) is amended by redesignating clauses (1), (2), and (3) thereof as clauses (A), (B), and (C), respectively, by inserting "(1)" after "(a)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) Every individual who (A) is not entitled to benefits under paragraph (1) of this subsection, (B) has filed application for primary insurance benefits, (C) is under a disability (as defined in section 209 (s)) which has continued for six consecutive calendar months after December 31, 1948, (D) was a currently insured individual on any day during such 6 months period and had 20 quarters of coverage within the 40 calendar quarter period ending with any quarter which includes any month in such 6 months period, shall be entitled to receive a primary insurance benefit for each month after June 30, 1949, beginning with the first month in which he becomes so entitled to such insurance benefits and ending with the month immediately preceding the first month in which any of the following occurs: He ceases to be under a disability, becomes entitled to benefits under paragraph (1) of this subsection, or dies.

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (2), an individual shall be deemed to be a currently insured individual on any day if, had he died on such day, he would have died a currently insured individual (as defined in section 209 (h)).

"(4) Any individual who ceases, by reason of entitlement to benefits under paragraph (2) hereof, to be entitled to benefits under any other subsection of this section shall, if no other event has occurred which would terminate his entitlement to benefits under such other subsection, be entitled to benefits under such other subsection for each month, beginning with the month following the month in which his entitlement to benefits under paragraph (2) of this subsection ceases."

(b) Effective with respect to applications for benefits filed after June 30, 1949, clause (A) of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of such section 202 is amended to read as follows: "(A) has attained the age of 60, or in the case of a wife whose husband is entitled to benefits under paragraph (2) of subsection (a), had at the time of filing her application for wife's insurance benefits, in her care (individually or jointly with her husband) a child of her husband entitled to receive a child's insurance benefit,".

(c) Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of such section 202 is further amended by inserting therein after "they are divorced a vinculo matrimonii," the following: "her husband ceases to be entitled to primary insurance benefits by reason of his recovery from a disability, no child of her husband is entitled to receive a child's insurance benefit and she has not attained the age of 60,".

(d) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of such section 202 is amended by striking out "or attains the age of 18" and inserting in lieu thereof "such insured individual ceases to be entitled to primary insurance benefits by reason of recovery from a disability, such child attains the age of 18".

(e) Subsection (d) of section 203 of such act is amended by inserting between paragraphs (1) and (3) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) if a wife under age 60 entitled to a wife's insurance benefit, did not have in her care (individually or jointly with her husband) a child of her husband entitled to receive a child's insurance benefit; or".

(f) Such section 203 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) Deductions, in such amounts and at such time or times as the Administrator shall determine, shall be made from any benefits payable under this section with respect to the wages of an individual until the total of such deductions equals such benefits for any month, during a period of disability, in which such individual failed to submit himself for examination in accordance with regulations of the Administrator, and for any month thereafter until the month in which he does so submit himself for examination."

(g) Subsection (m) of section 205 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(m) No application for any benefit under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 202 filed prior to 7 months before the first month for which the applicant becomes entitled to receive such benefit shall be accepted as an application for purposes of this title; and no application for any benefit under any other provisions of such section filed prior to 3 months before the first month for which the applicant becomes entitled to receive such benefit shall be accepted as an application for purposes of this title."

(h) Subsection (f) of section 209 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The term 'average monthly wage' means the quotient obtained by dividing the total wages paid an individual before the quarter in which he died or became entitled to receive primary insurance benefits, whichever first occurred (excluding any wages paid him during a period of disability), by three times the number of quarters elapsing after 1936 and before such quarter in which he died or became so entitled, excluding any quarter prior to the quarter in which he attained the age of 22 during which he was paid less than $50 of wages, any quarter in a period of disability, and any quarter, after the quarter in which he attained age 65, occurring prior to 1939."

(i) Paragraph (1) of subsection (g) of such section 209 is amended by inserting therein after "whichever first occurred" the following: "(excluding from such elapsed quarters any quarter in a period of disability (as defined in subsection (t))".

(j) Such subsection (g) is further amended by striking out "As used in this subsection, and in subsection (h) of this section," and inserting in lieu thereof "As used in this subsection, in subsection (h) of this section, and in subsection (a) of section 202,".

(k) Subsection (h) of such section 209 is amended by inserting before the period at

the end thereof ", excluding from the count of such 12 calendar quarters any quarter in a period of disability".

(l) Such section 209 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(s) The term 'disability' means total inability to work by reason of illness, injury, or other impairment. An individual is totally unable to work when he is afflicted with any impairment which renders it impossible for him to engage in any substantially gainful work, as defined in regulations of the Administrator.

"(t) An individual's 'period of disability' means all quarters for any month of which he is entitled to benefits under section 202 (a) (2) and the two quarters immediately preceding the first such quarter.

"(u) (1) The Administrator shall by regulation provide for such examinations of individuals as he deems necessary for purposes of determining entitlement to benefits under section 202 (a) (2). In accordance with regulations prescribed by him, the Administrator may find, solely because an individual refuses to submit to such an examination, that such individual is not under a disability or that his disability, previously determined to exist, has ceased.

"(2) The Administrator may make provision for furnishing medical, surgical, institutional, rehabilitation, or other services to individuals entitled to receive benefits under section 202 (a) (2) if he believes such services may aid in enabling such individuals to return to gainful work. For the purpose of this paragraph there shall be available, for each calendar year beginning with the calendar year 1951, an amount equal to 2 percent of the total amount expended from the trust fund during the preceding fiscal year for the payment of benefits with respect to the wages of individuals entitled to benefits under section 202 (a) (2). For the calendar years 1949 and 1950, there shall be available for such purpose 2 percent of the estimated expenditures from the trust fund during such years for the payment of benefits with respect to the wages of such individuals. The managing trustee shall make payments from the trust fund to carry out the purposes of this paragraph when certified to him by the Administrator.

"(3) The Administrator may enter into agreements with any agency of the United States, of any State, or of any political subdivision of any State for the provision of the services or examinations under paragraphs (1) and (2), and may when necessary, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, enter into contracts with qualified persons for providing such services or examinations."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5298) to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think every Member of the Senate will be interested in what I am about to say and to read.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand the Senator from Indiana is going to speak on a subject of very great interest and one which I believe all Senators will want to hear. If the Senator will yield to me for the purpose I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no objection to that. I want it understood, however, that I am not personally suggesting the absence of a quorum, but will yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that we have had a quorum call, I find about as few Senators present as were present before the quorum call. However, I appreciate that Senators are busy in committee meetings.

This year the Congress voted an appropriation of $27,000,000, as I recall the figure, to support the Voice of America. I do not know how many millions we have voted in the past. It was my understanding that it was to be a means of educating the peoples of the world as to our way of life and the good things about our country. I hold in my hand a script of one of the broadcasts, covering the States of Nevada and Utah. I have on my desk scripts relating to Alabama, Texas, and Pennsylvania.

If I correctly understand, the Voice of America, which is under the jurisdiction of the office of the Secretary of State, has had a young man and a young woman traveling over the United States. In these broadcasts they have been telling the world about our respective 48 States.

As I stated a moment ago, the broadcast which I hold in my hand, covers Nevada and Utah. It is unfortunate that we have no music here today; and it is unfortunate that we have no sound effects or voices in the background, because, not being an actor and not being accustomed to speaking on the radio, I may not do a very good job.

However, I wish to read the broadcast as sent out by our Government at the taxpayers' expense to the Central and South American countries. This broadcast was originally done in Spanish. I hold the English translation. The script which I hold in my hand was given to me by those in charge of the Voice of America programs. It is entitled, "English Translation—Know North America." I call particular attention to that. The title is "Know North America."

The caption reads further:

Script broadcast in Spanish to Latin America by National Broadcasting Co. on February 2, 1948.

Mr. President, when I say "music," I mean that music was heard at that point in the broadcast. Of course, in this instance it means that we should hear music, although we shall not. When I say "announcer," that refers to one of the two persons who, in the broadcast, were supposed to be traveling over the United States in an effort to educate the world in regard to our 48 States. The narrator was supposed to be one of those two persons. "Voice II" means one of the two persons talking to the narrator.

Now here is the broadcast:

Music: Theme up and under.

Announcer: The National Broadcasting Co. presents: Know North America, a weekly program in which we relate the adventures of two travelers who continue to discover the many wonders of historical and present life in the U. S. A.

Please notice that it says "historical and present life in the United States."

Then—

Music: Up and out plane, establish, then under.

That is the background.

Then—

Voice: Let me see—Oh—This immense expanse of white, is it Nevada?

Narrator: Yes—one of the biggest States in the Union, and it has only 110,000 inhabitants.

Voice: Then how can it be a State?

Narrator: One hundred thousand is the minimum.

Does anyone know of any law in the United States that requires that before a new State can be admitted into the Union, a minimum of 100,000 people must be living within its area?

Voice II: Is it possible that there is so much snow here? This doesn't seem like the West, but like a Siberian steppe.

Comparing it to Russia—

Narrator: But it's quite the opposite. The immense white expanse is a desert.

Voice II: Really?

Narrator: Of course it is. The Spanish conquerors were also deceived by the mirage, when Gaspar de Portola's soldiers saw this desert from the peak of that mountain, they shouted, "What a lot of snow!"

Voice: But they were disappointed.

Narrator: And what a disappointment! When they came down, the snow had turned to scorching sand. So it is that every time

they referred to these regions, they talked about the big snowy country.

Voice II: Is this historical?

Narrator: Absolutely.

Voice II: Does this mean that Nevada owes its name to an optical illusion?

Narrator: Exactly.

Voice II: That's right, you're handsome.

Narrator: His name is.

Laughter.

Music, Up and out.

Still in the plane.

Mr. President, I presume they were flying over Nevada.

Then—

Voice (more or less alarmed)—

Note this, Mr. President; I suppose I should be more or less alarmed—

Listen, are we leaving Nevada behind?

Narrator: Yes; the plane flies directly from San Francisco to Salt Lake City.

Voice: What a shame.

Narrator: Why? Nevada has no interest in itself:

Listen to this:

Nevada has no interest in itself; it's a land of cowboys, and its two principal cities are in competition. In Las Vegas people get married, and in Reno they get divorced.

Mr. President, this is enlightening. We are supposed to be enlightening the world in this way—and we are spending millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money on these programs.

Voice: Yes, but you are forgetting that Nevada is the only State where you can play roulette. And, if we passed through Reno, I could get a divorce.

That is most enlightening; is it not? I am sure the people of Nevada appreciated that.

Then—

Narrator: You? From whom?

Voice: From you?

Laughter.

Voice: If he and I continue alone, we will get to know North America better.

The people of South America must have enjoyed listening to that.

Then—

Narrator: Oh, yes; getting up at four in the afternoon and leading a night life.

Voice: Well, what about it? All the self-respecting animals, the tiger, the lion, and the panther, sleep in the daytime and hunt at night. The hens are the only ones that go to bed at six in the evening.

Mr. President, the taxpayers are the ones who are paying to send that sort of trash over the radio to the people of Central America and South America.

Then—

Narrator: Don't you worry, we'll go back to Nevada, but first we have to stop in Salt Lake City.

Voice: What for?

Voice II: Utah is a very interesting State.

Voice: Oh, Utah. That's where men have as many wives as they can support?

Mind you, Mr. President, this is going over the radio to the peoples of the world.

Then—

Voice II: There's a gleam in your eye.

Narrator: But, man, you can't even support one.

Laughter into, up, and out. Light traffic. Three pairs of feet on pavement; stop.

Voice II: What a monumental piece of work.

Narrator: That's the famous Mormon Tabernacle. It was built by Brigham Young, one of the greatest colonizers in American history.

Voice II: How the Mormons suffered in their Odyssey from New York to Utah.

Narrator: In that period of deep religious feeling, people persisted in believing that the Mormons were trying to revive paganism. Joseph Smith, the prophet of the new religion, was assassinated by the people, and then Brigham Young took charge of the tribe and led it across deserts and mountains in search of the promised land.

Voice: Like Moses?

Narrator: Moses knew where he was going, but the Mormons did not. When they reached this spot and discovered that the water in the lake was salty, Young raised his eyes to heaven and said: "Jehova, I will build the New Zion on the borders of this new lake, because its waters are salty."

Voice II: And what a beautiful city they built.

Brigham Young governed the Mormons for 30 years with an iron hand, like an absolute emperor. When Mark Twain, the great humorist, visited this city in 1860, he said that the only thing which resembled the discipline of the Mormons was the Prussian Army.

[Laughter.]

Leaving the impression that they are still disciplined along those lines. Mind you, Mr. President, these broadcasts are sent out to people all over the world.

Then the script shows that there was laughter—that the persons giving the broadcast were laughing in an attempt to show they thought that was funny.

Then—

Voice II: Young used to carry a bottle of whisky in one pocket and a cut of chewing tobacco in the other.

Mr. President, I am sure that those of us in the Senate who voted to appropriate $27,000,000 for these broadcasts are proud of that statement, and are proud that we appropriated so much money to have some fool broadcast that sort of information to the people throughout the the world.

Voice: How is that? Aren't the Mormons supposed to be very strict?

Narrator: Certainly, and that is why Young did it. Two or three times a day he pulled out the liquor and tobacco, smelled them, and put them back in the pocket.

Voice: So as not waste them?

Narrator: No; to prove that he was stronger than vice.

Voice: That is what is called having will power.

Narrator: Brigham Young was a primitive priest, who didn't counsel virtue, but imposed it.

Voice: How about the story that he had 40 wives; is that a lie?

Narrator: No. The Mormons were polygamous, but not for want of morality.

Voice: And what do you call it?

Narrator: I have no opinion, but they say that the Mormons instituted polygamy to defend themselves against their enemies.

Note this, Mr. President:

Voice: Those are excuses.

So, Mr. President, we have spent $27,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in order to have such broadcasts made to the people of the world.

Then—

Narrator: They were very few in number, and had to increase the population rapidly.

Voice II: And did they succeed?

Narrator: Of course, so far nobody has succeeded in dislodging the Mormon dynasty in Utah.

Voice: Not even politically?

Narrator: Eighty percent of the population is Mormon, and the Governor, Senators, Representatives, etc., etc., belong to to the sect.

Voice: So Utah is a kind of oyster?

That was a great contribution to the enlightenment of the world—to say that Utah is a kind of oyster.

Then—

Narrator: This is the only people in the world which is governed by religion, and legally so, because the citizens vote.

Voice II: But they vote for Mormons.

Voice: Of course, the day they vote for someone else they will lose control.

Music. Up and out.

Voice II: What a strange church.

Narrator: That is the secret church, which only the prophet and the 12 apostles enter.

Voice (laughs): Is that what they are called?

Narrator: Yes; they are the ones who govern the sect.

Voice II: Does this mean that no one can enter?

Narrator: Only a chosen group, the highest directors of the tribe.

Imagine referring to the people of Utah today as a tribe.

Voice: This seems to me neither Christian nor democratic.

That statement went out, if you please, all over the world—"This seems to be neither Christian nor democratic."

Narrator: When they are subjected to criticism they ask frankly: "Do all the Catholics reach the Pope?"

Voice: It's true, they aren't entirely wrong. There must be a distinction in rank.

Narrator: The symbol of Utah is the beehive, and these are the Mormons, tireless and faithful bees. The sect, whose capital is truly fabulous, controls all the business in the State.

Voice: And who are the stockholders?

Narrator: There aren't any.

Apparently that is trying to prove that Utah is a communistic or socialistic State.

Everyone is obliged to give 10 percent to the State in perpetuity.

I want to read that again:

Everyone is obliged to give 10 percent to the State, in perpetuity.

That is not a true statement.

Voice II: Very well, and what do they do with so much money?

Voice: I suppose that the Twelve Apostles will manage it.

Narrator: They manage it, but they do not touch it. They spend it all on the community, in public works, hospitals, charitable institutions, and, above all, in schools, which are numerous and very fine in Utah.

That is an example of broadcasting to the world at the expense of the taxpayers that Utah—and it is not true; it is a lie to begin with—is some sort of socialistic State in which everybody contributes 10 percent to the State.

Voice II: Does this mean that no Mormon has the right to ask for an accounting?

Narrator: He doesn't ask for any and they don't give him any. The church is sacred, and distributes funds as it pleases.

Voice: And suppose a Mormon decides not to continue giving up one-tenth?

Narrator: Ah, for this the sect has a little army, called the avenging angels.

Voice II: Which assume the task of convincing those who do not pay?

Narrator: Naturally.

Voice II: In what manner?

Narrator: With convincing arguments.

Voice: Made of rubber or wood?

[Laughter.]

That would leave the impression that there is a secret organization called the avenging angels, and that if a person does not pay 10 percent to the State, as stated in the script, they have a way of making him do it. The narrator wants to know if that convincing argument is made of rubber or wood, leaving the impression I presume that they take him out into the woodshed and proceed to pound him either with a rubber or a wooden substance. I ask Senators, are they not proud to have had a part in contributing $27,000,000 to that sort of thing?

Music. Bridge.

Voice II: This hotel is as luxurious as the Waldorf Astoria.

Voice: Does it belong to the church also?

Narrator: Of course. Don't you see the beehive on the door? The sect owns 60 percent of the business houses in the State: this hotel and the Temple Square Hotel, 3 daily papers and several reviews, a radio station, 2 banks, the Utah State National Bank and the Zion Savings Bank and Trust Co., the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co., the Beneficial Life Insurance Co., and hundreds of houses, buildings, farms, etc., etc.

Voice (whistles): And what does not belong to them?

Narrator: Hardly anything; but you can rest assured that the money that comes in is used entirely for the common good. You will already have observed that this city, without any exaggeration, is the cleanest and most orderly city in the United States.

The common folks own everything, they say.

Voice II: That is true

Narrator: And that is because the church is efficient and honorable. The Mormons claim—

Mr. President, listen to this. Listen to this:

The Mormons claim that if the whole world were to adopt their methods there would no longer be economic problems.

Up to this point apparently it was endeavored by this broadcast to show that there is some sort of socialistic state in Utah, to which the people contribute 10 percent, and that the State owns everything. Let me read that again:

Narrator: And that is because the church is efficient and honorable. The Mormons claim that if the whole world were to adopt their methods there would no longer be economic problems.

That is an insult to the United States Senate, to the people of the Nation, and particularly to the people of Utah, because the people of Utah are the same as the people of every other State of the Union.

Voice: They all say that.

Narrator: The sect does not oblige anybody to do anything, but everyone does his duty, and if they don't drink or smoke, it is not because of hypocrisy, but because they have a tremendous responsibility toward God to care for their bodies as well as their souls.

Voice: I don't understand it. Give me a lecture.

Narrator: The Mormons believe firmly in the resurrection of the flesh, and that is why they treat their bodies with the greatest possible respect.

Voice II: Naturally, since they only have one.

Voice: That is foolish; the body can stand anything.

Narrator: And the souls also, but according to the Mormons, he who dies with a perfect body and a clean soul will have a right to reincarnate in full youth on the final judgment day.

Voice: What for?

One of the two wants to know why, and what for.

Narrator: They hope to go on living in the next world.

Voice: With the cooperative and everything else?

That is insulting, Mr. President. It is an insult to their religion—"with the cooperative and everything else."

Narrator: No, but——

Voice II: Then why do they die?

Voice: So that they can have a new body, and on with the fiesta.

That is what the taxpayers are paying money for.

Mr. President, do Senators appreciate the significance of that statement, asking the question, with respect to people in Utah, "Then why do they die?" And the voice says:

So that they can have a new body, and on with the fiesta.

Narrator: What seems strange and even funny to us, has achieved great practical results.

Voice II: For instance?

Narrator: In Utah there are neither strikes nor political disturbances and they work as hard as anywhere. Furthermore, this State is at the head in public instruction. The Mormons are expert in languages. During the war, many of the translators and interpreters came from here to work for the Government and the Army.

Voice II: Now you know it, so don't talk so loud.

Voice: A fine time to tell me.

Narrator: Just imagine that Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, one of the best educated Members of the Congress, once wrote a book on Mormonism and in Japanese, and during the war he always talked on short wave to the Japanese, urging them to surrender.

Music. Up and out.

Street noises.

Voice II: Why do people greet us so politely?

Voice: They think that we have faces like Mormons.

Imagine sending that out on the radio—evidently insinuating that Mormons have different faces from those of other persons. That would be one reason for making that statement.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator have the names of the persons who wrote this and actually broadcast it?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator intend to put the information into the RECORD?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I intend to put in a considerable amount of it. When I get through I think I shall offer a suggestion as to what I think the Senate should do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator have information as to who supervises it?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has not stated the date of that broadcast.

Mr. CAPEHART. The date of this broadcast is February 2, 1948.

Narrator: No; they know that we are strangers, and they want to instruct us in the faith.

Voice II: What for?

Voice: For the 10 percent?

Can the Senate imagine anything so insulting as that? It leaves the impression that everyone who visits Salt Lake City is subject to having 10 percent taken from him by the people.

Narrator: They are too rich and noble to think about that. They do it because their great and only fear is to lose their majority. At present, 80 percent of the population is Mormon, and if strangers continue moving in——

Voice II: The 80 percent will decrease, and they will lose their power?

Voice: Now I understand.

I can understand that they do not want 10 percent of the money, but they want to keep their power. But the Senators can see how insidious the whole thing is when we weave it together.

Voice: Now I understand. It is now they would need polygamy.

Narrator: Yes; but it won't come back.

Voice: Why?

Narrator: While Utah was a Territory they could do what they wanted, but in order to become a State they had to comply with the Constitution——

Voice II: And give up polygamy?

Narrator: Of course.

Voice: This little matter cost them plenty.

What was the little matter that "cost them plenty," according to this broadcast? Coming into the United States and obeying our Constitution.

Then there is laughter indicated. I assume they laughed at great length.

Voice II: Look, the tabernacle is closed.

Narrator: Naturally, today is Sunday.

Voice: How naturally, since it is on Sunday that all the churches are open?

Narrator: But not here; Sunday is a day of rest. Nobody does anything.

Voice: They don't even pray, do they?

Narrator: Yes, in their thoughts.

Voice II: What intelligent people. On Sunday they don't even give their lips any work. But I suppose that they eat, don't they?

Can the Senate imagine such silly stuff being broadcast? It is unbelievable, to me; I do not know how the Senate may feel about it.

Voice: Naturally, one has to care for one's body.

Music: Up and under.

Narrator: The biblical and social experiment of Brigham Young has been a resounding success; in Utah there are neither taxes nor political struggles nor any kind of speculations, because the morality of the church stands above all personal egotisms.

That does not require any comment from me. There are taxes in Utah. There are Federal taxes. To say the State of Utah is different from any other

State is insulting. So I shall not even mention it; it is so ridiculous.

When Brigham Young planted his tents on the shores of Salt Lake he shouted to the legions of his enemies: "Give me a truce of 10 years and you will be astonished at my work." The prophet kept his word; today Utah is the cleanest and loveliest dwelling place in the immense palace of the United States.

Music: Up and out.

Announcer: You have just heard Know the United States, a weekly program in which we relate the adventure of two travelers who continue to discover the marvels of the historical and present life in the United States. The participants in this program were * * *.

Production and artistic effects were under the direction of Juan José Vasquez.

Music up and. * * *

That was Utah. I have some more here. Senators will understand that these two persons have been traveling all over the United States, going into the 48 States.

The next is a broadcast on Alabama. I hope the Senators from that State are present. I do not know whether I have all of the broadcast on Alabama, but I have sufficient to disgust anyone. It opens with comments on Mobile, as follows:

Narrator: I want to show you something original, or shall I say "ironic"? Take a look at the name of this street.

Two: Jefferson Davis Avenue.

One: Wasn't that the president of the Southern Confederation?

Narrator: Exactly.

Two: And what is ironic about that?

Narrator: On this avenue, as you can see, only Negroes live.

Two: And he defended slavery and was the most bitter enemy of Lincoln's ideals.

One: That will show you that the dead do not return, because if they did the spirit of Davis would have removed the signs from this street.

Mr. President, that is what we appropriated $27,000,000 for, evidently. That represents some of the silly things we do in Congress from time to time. Unfortunately we have no control over what these people do with the money which we appropriate. We are getting a little example of it at the moment.

Laughter is indicated. They all laughed about it.

Narrator: We are at Birmingham, the Pittsburgh of the South and the most important city in Alabama. It has a population of 300,000, and its principal industries are iron and steel.

One: And this city is like those two metals, hard and poorly made.

We appropriated $27,000,000 for the purpose, I thought, of telling the peoples of the world at least some of the good things about this country. I shall read that statement again:

And this city is like those two metals, hard and poorly made.

Narrator: That is true. It was constructed in a hurry and they have not had time to improve it.

Can the Senators imagine that? The taxpayers money has been appropriated to tell the world about wonderful America, supposedly to educate the world in what we have here and for what we stand, our historical background, and our form, kind, and type of government; and this is how it is spent!

Two: Alabama is not a State of stupendous cities of brilliant history, but it has the importance of being the darkest of all.

One: The darkest? What are you referring to?

Narrator: In no other part of the United States has the colored race struggled and suffered so much as here.

I am certain that the people of Alabama who pay State taxes and Federal taxes will appreciate the fact that their money is being used to advertise them to the peoples throughout the world in such a light.

One: The darkest? What are you referring to?

Narrator: In no other part of the United States has the colored race struggled and suffered so much as here.

Two: Oh, I understand.

Narrator: And since there are more Negroes than whites in Alabama——

Which is a lie—

their contribution to progress has been very important.

(Narrator continues.) And do not think that the descendants of the slave continue to be laborers only. Since slavery was more intense here, it is only logical that liberty should also be more intense despite certain absurd laws that have not been eliminated.

We are advertising to the world about what a wonderful country we are, that we have a representative form of government, democracy and liberty, yet this sort of thing goes out.

The script moves to Montgomery, Ala., State capitol.

One: See what was holding up the traffic.

That must have sounded fine over the radio to the people down there. One narrator says to the other, "See what was holding up the traffic."

Two: An oxcart.

Narrator: That is a symbol of the spirit of Montgomery.

I am certain that the people of Alabama are happy over the description of Birmingham and the description of Montgomery, Ala. I shall read that again, because it seems to me that it would be almost impossible for anyone to be so silly as to put this sort of thing out.

The script moves to Montgomery, Ala., State Capital.

One: See what was holding up the traffic.

Two: An oxcart.

Then the narrator said:

That is a symbol of the spirit of Montgomery.

Mind you, this went out on February 2, 1948.

Narrator: Alabama has wanted to show the rest of the world that even though it used to be the most determined in favor of slavery, today it is the most democratic of all.

One: Well, that is quite something.

Two: You who are looking for a place to establish your home, why not settle here? They give you the land free.

Mind you, Mr. President, this is going out to the world. They say, "You who are looking for a place to establish your home, why not settle here? They give you the land free."

One: Thank you. I do not like the cities where Mondays are the same as Sundays. Let us continue the tour.

"I do not like the cities where Mondays are the same as Sundays."

What is the inference, and what would that mean to the Spanish-speaking people of South America?

Now we will go to Pennsylvania.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to comment on the broadcast about the State of Alabama. I do not come from Alabama, but I went to school in that State, and I know many people there. Alabama is a great State, and the people are a great people. Those people have been slandered by the expenditure of money appropriated by the American Congress, and I brand those statements for what they are, as merely contemptible, damnable lies.

Mr. CAPEHART. I might say that Alabama is going to be no exception in being slandered, because I think the Senator will find that every State in the Union has been slandered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Alabama is a State I know much about, and I think I am qualified to make the statement I have made.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator.

Now let us move to Pennsylvania.

Voice: So this is Philadelphia.

Narrator: Yes; the city of fraternal love.

Voice: What kind of love?

Mr. President, that appears here, and it is paid for by the taxpayers' money.

Narrator: Fraternal. William Penn was head of a religious sect, Quakerism. Founded by a shoemaker and——

Voice: They must have been people of low class, considering the status of the founder.

Let me read that again:

They must have been people of low class, considering the status of the founder.

Narrator: On the contrary, they were and continue to be a social problem.

Voice: Why?

Narrator: The Quakers never take oath before any court of justice and they oppose military service because they believe that war is a struggle of monsters.

Voice: Of course it is. And what kind of religion is this religion?

Narrator: The most simple and original of all. The Quakers meet in halls devoid of ornaments and they wait in concentration the arrival of the Holy Spirit.

Narrator: That is Constitution Square and according to municipal ordinance you can only talk about liberty, equality, and fraternity there.

Voice: Splendid. If every country had a square like that the world would not be what it is today.

Narrator: Here the signing of the Declaration of Independence took place and here two great men of opposite tendencies, Jefferson and Hamilton, debated to the end. In this square the violent scenes of the French Revolution were repeated and the

multitude cried: "Down with the aristocrats—down with Washington."

Voice: Washington?

Narrator. Yes. There was so much confusion that they even forgot his sacrifices. But these injustices and these struggles were useful. The civic and the philosophical experiment was not the failure that Hamilton predicted but the success that Jefferson upheld. The Republic and the democracy survive to this day.

Voice: And forever.

Traffic up. Sound of horn, truck suddenly stops. Voices, yells, etc.

Narrator: Say, what is happening to you.

Voice (nervous): Nothing; nothing.

Narrator: You almost got killed by that bus. Did you go to sleep in the midst of traffic?

Sound: Girls' laughter.

Voice: No; it was that——

Narrator: You stopped to look at the girls.

Voice: Say, do you think they could be Quakers?

Narrator (laughs): No. The Quakers live outside Philadelphia.

Voice: What a pity.

Narrator: Why?

Voice: Because I would like to talk familiarly with all of them.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, that is what we are paying for. That was broadcast throughout the world. I know my colleagues are just as much ashamed as I am. I think I voted against that $27,000,000, although I am not certain.

I continue the reading:

State of program:

Voice: What time did we leave New York?

Narrator: At 2:30.

Voice: What State is this?

Narrator: Pennsylvania.

Voice: Is that the name of an Indian city or some Indian chief?

Narrator: No. The word "Pennsylvania" is made up of two words. Penn, the name of the first governor, and sylvania, derived from the Latin word meaning forest. In other words, this State is called Penn's forest.

Voice: And who was Penn?

Narrator: An English gentleman to whom His Majesty owed 25,000 pounds, a rather large sum in the seventeenth century, hence the King could not pay him.

Voice: Is that possible?

Narrator: Of course it is. The English monarchs were not always rich. Charles II once appeared at court with a torn stocking.

Voice: (Laughs).

Mr. President, that is really something for us to be telling the people of the world, is it not? We appropriate $27,000,000 to tell that the King of England in the seventeenth century owed Penn 25,000 pounds, and once went to court with a torn stocking. Then they all laughed, because it says "Laughs."

Narrator: According to chronicles William Penn was one of those hard creditors who tried to collect by letter and in person.

Voice: Don't talk to me about that. I know them quite well.

Narrator: Besides being persistent, Penn was a practical man and one day he arrived at the conclusion that a king who had holes in his stocking would never be able to pay him the $80,000 debt.

Voice: Naturally.

Narrator: The Quakers have rather strange customs. They never take off their hats, and they speak familiarly to everybody.

Then the voice says:

How fresh!

The narrator says:

Nothing of the sort. They are respectful and charitable.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I have also a program on Texas, or at least a part of one. This is:

Texas, December 5, 1947.

Sounds: Cowboys yip, yipping.

Narrator: This is the traditional yell of the man of the plains, the true civilizer of Texas.

Hoof beats. Yells. Music into Home on the Range.

Narrator: Texas is one of nature's disturbing experiments. Its area is infinite * * * its beauty varied and its history has been a succession of tempests.

Man II: Do you mean to say that bandits really exist here?

Narrator: I have told you that Texas is the State of miracles. An American writer has made the statement—

Listen to this, Mr. President, Senators from New England will enjoy this. I am glad to see the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in the Chamber.

New England was founded by hypocrisy and Texas * * * by sin. [Laughter.]

Senators would hardly believe that such a thing would be sent out.

New England was founded by hypocrisy and Texas * * * by sin.

Man II: How is that? Were not the missionaries the ones who—

Narrator (chuckle): The Indians from Texas were so difficult to convert that a Franciscan priest wrote to the bishop that "these savages have to be converted to Christianity by force of arms." [Laughter.]

Narrator: Texas, individual in everything, was not conquered by soldiers nor by priests.

Man I: By whom then?

And listen to this:

Narrator. By 600 cows with their respective bulls.

(Narrator then relates how Don Juan de Onate arrived in El Paso in 1598 with a large entourage and herd of cattle.)

Then the narrator goes on and says:

In less than 80 years the cows, with the help of the bulls, of course—

Mr. President, I am reading from this script—

with the help of the bulls, of course, transformed Texas into the center of the cattle industry.

Man II: Are Texans today as independent as the first settlers?

Narrator: They are really and completely different from the rest of America. They continue being first of all citizens of Texas * * * and after that, of the United States.

Mr. President, I have one on Colorado. It is rather long, and I believe I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Does not the Senator from Indiana think he has gone far enough? I am afraid he will come to a broadcast concerning New Mexico.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am certain that those who did the broadcasting would be just as insulting respecting New Mexico as they were respecting Alabama, Texas, Utah, Nevada, and other States.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in all seriousness, I want to say that what the Senator from Indiana has said this afternoon, though there has been laughter throughout the Chamber over it, amounts to a downright tragedy.

I regret deeply that any agency of Government has used any funds or any facilities procured from such funds to portray to any nation features respecting any State such as have been read here this afternoon. I hope that what the Senator has read, together with the revelation of other bad features I have heard concerning the Voice of America program—and I have been one of the strong supporters for the right kind of a program—will have the effect of stopping such drivel, nonsense, and downright falsehoods as have been set forth in these broadcasts.

I should say that Mr. Allen, who has recently been confirmed, should have a copy of these broadcasts, and I hope that his agency will call the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today to his attention, and that such drivel as is contained in these broadcasts will be stopped now, and that no other State will be subject to the insults and the utterly nonsensical pictures which these broadcasts have given. They cannot be too severely condemned.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with what the Senator from New Mexico has said. I agree with what the Senator from Indiana has said concerning the implications that must be drawn from the broadcasts. While I feel that it would be a tragedy to have the program continue in this way, I would add to what the Senator from New Mexico has said, that that is no reason for stopping it. I am confident that the Senator from Indiana will agree with me, whether or not he voted for the Voice of America measure, that what we have in this country is worth talking about, worth doing something about, and worth trying to spread. I feel very sincerely that the Senator from Indiana has done a public service in informing the Senate as to the character of this "stuff."

I agree that possibly there was some hypocrisy in the founding of New England. I am confident that the Senators from Texas will not agree that there was any sin in the founding of Texas. All of that stuff is baloney. But what we are trying to do through the medium of this agency is to render a service to our country and to the peace and security of the world. I am confident the Senator from Indiana will agree with me in that statement.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator agree with me that it seems almost incredible that such programs should have been sent over the Voice of America? Does he not agree with me that it is almost impossible to believe that such programs could be broadcast, if anyone having to do with them had the least bit of common horse sense or judgment? One would think that any 10-year-old child, if he had picked up that script and read it in advance of its being broadcast, would have said that it should not have been used.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator. What we have heard respect-

ing Mr. Allen and his background, his intelligence, and his knowledge of the world, should make us believe that he will prevent anything of that kind being continued in the future.

I think we can commend the Senator from Indiana for making this scene, if we may call it a scene, this afternoon, but I hope that he will not permit the impression to go out from this body that the Voice of America program should not be continued, and should not be improved, and that our effort to spread knowledge of the opportunities existing in our country should not be continued. What the country is and what it stands for is something which should be made known to the people throughout the world, who are crying for such knowledge, if we can believe what we read in the newspapers.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the able Senator from Massachusetts, but my opinion is that such broadcasts as those I have read will do the Nation more harm than good. I agree that it should be very simple to employ American citizens who would prepare stories about our Nation which would be valuable and informative to the peoples of the world. We certainly have had sufficient instances of success, and there are so many good things about our Nation to tell the peoples of the world that they should be the subjects of these broadcasts, rather than the trash I have read on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more statement?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Voice of America would give, as one example of what this country has stood for, and the possibilities there are for its people to succeed, it could do no better than to describe the life of the Senator from Indiana, who addressed the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. SMITH and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield first to the Senator from New Jersey, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Indiana mentioned to me yesterday that he was going to bring up the matter he has discussed today. As the Senator from New Mexico has said, he and I have high hopes respecting the value of the Voice of America program. I made inquiries as to how it came to happen that such programs as the Senator has read were broadcast. I called the State Department only this afternoon, and I said I hoped they would send to me at the earliest possible moment a statement of the situation; how it could have happened, and where the script came from.

The preliminary statement I have—and I merely mention it subject to correction—is that the broadcasts were made under one of the contracts entered into with the National Broadcasting Co. and that the broadcasting was done under the provisions of last year's contract when the State Department was limited in its funds in providing supervision, which is one of the difficulties encountered in connection with the programs.

I am not saying this in defense of what has happened, because those in charge of the program are entirely responsible for it. What has happened should not have happened. But the fact remains that today, in considering the remaking of contracts, the question of supervision is a primary one. I have insisted that something be done so that such a result as this cannot happen. It is no alibi to say that "We did not have anyone to read the scripts, and therefore we are not responsible for them." The State Department is responsible, and it will have to take the responsibility. I have asked the Department to make a very clear statement to us, so that we shall know how this happened. A contract was farmed out to the National Broadcasting Co. The scripts were not written by any member of the State Department, but the State Department has a responsibility.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Jersey mean to say that the State Department of this Government farmed out the writing of scripts broadcast abroad, without any power of supervision over them?

Mr. SMITH. Apparently last year, when it was insisted that the Department should let contracts for some of this work, it made contracts, under general directions, for example, that the broadcasts should be statements of fact with regard to the States of the United States, without any expressions of opinion. What has happened is that, because of the lack of supervision—and there is no excuse for it—this terrible kind of material has gone out. I am not defending it, but I am trying to give the facts. I propose to have a statement by tomorrow which I shall read into the RECORD.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, my first intention was to introduce a bill amending the act under which we appropriated this money so as to require that every broadcast be printed in the Federal Register in English within 10 days after it was made. I had to give up that idea. I have given it up temporarily, for the reason that I now find that 300,000 words are broadcast each day. I do not say that they are words similar to the words which I have read. I am sure that not all the broadcasts are of that character. However, 300,000 words a day are broadcast, and, of course, it is a problem for the Secretary of State and his staff properly to supervise 300,000 words a day. I am aware of the difficulty. Mistakes will happen; but what I read this afternoon were not particularly mistakes; the scripts were written that way.

The only suggestion I can offer, unless we wish to require that the 300,000 words be printed each day so that the public may see what is being said, is that under the existing law the Secretary of State be required to make available to the Senate and to the House, as well as to the Library of Congress, translations in English of everything that is said each day by the Voice of America.

I am offering this suggestion for the benefit of the leadership of the Senate. I am suggesting that we ask the Secretary of State, under the existing law, to furnish to the Secretary of the Senate, the Secretary of the House, and the Library of Congress, a copy of every word that is broadcast each day, thereby making the broadcasts available to any one who cares to look at them, making them available to the Senate and to the House of Representatives. Perhaps that is one practical way of handling the problem. There may be a better way; but I must say that we owe a responsibility to the taxpayers of America to see that this sort of thing is stopped, and that the money is used for the purpose for which it was intended.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think what the Senator from Indiana has revealed as having taken place in the broadcasting to South America and Central America is tragic. The most serious aspect is that those words can never be retracted. They have gone forth on the airways, and it is impossible to recall them.

I am bound to say that we have had similar experience respecting previous broadcasts. No department of the Government—particularly the State Department, which supervises and is really responsible for the foreign relations of the United States has any right to allow words to go out to the nations of the world—300,000 or any other number—without strict supervision. I cannot understand how the Department could defend itself against the charge of lack of supervision. Our foreign relations in the world are at stake. This is a part of our foreign relations.

Mr. President, I think the time has come when the Congress must supervise these broadcasts. We should immediately revoke this appropriation until we know that every word is supervised by responsible persons in the State Department.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I could not quite hear all that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] said a while ago. Am I to understand that these broadcasts, so far as the private contracts are concerned, were produced by the National Broadcasting Co.?

Mr. SMITH. As I understand—and I shall have an official statement later to place in the RECORD, so as to keep the RECORD straight—last year when it was insisted that private agencies be used for these broadcasts, an arrangement was made with the National Broadcasting Co. to prepare a series of statements covering the facts with regard to the States of the United States. A contract was made, and this was the result. There is no possible defense for it; but being limited in funds, the Department did not have the proper personnel, according to its story, to check up on all these programs. It felt that the National Broadcasting Co. would itself do some censoring. Here we see the result.

The only answer is to eliminate these broadcasts entirely or to have an adequate staff, as suggested by the Senator from Michigan, so that every word can

be supervised before it is released. It is a problem.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not care how large or how small a staff the Department has. Are we to understand that no one in the State Department read the scripts which were broadcast, and which I have read this afternoon? Even an 8-year-old child, if he had read them, would have condemned them. In my opinion anyone in the State Department who was honest and had the best interests of America at heart would have blue-penciled them. It may well be that no one in the State Department read them.

Mr. SMITH. I have asked that very question. I have asked the Department whether or not anyone censored the scripts.

Mr. CAPEHART. If no one in the State Department saw the scripts before they were broadcast, in my opinion the State Department should be even more severely criticized.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator for yielding. I shall withhold further questions until I hear the report which the Senator from New Jersey is to make tomorrow.

We had quite a conflict in the committee and on the floor of the Senate as to how much supervision should be exercised by the State Department and how much should be exercised by private companies. There were those who took the position that the State Department should have had no right of supervision whatever, and that the entire program should be turned over to private broadcasting companies. What I am anxious to find out is what are the facts. I understand that the Senator from New Jersey will present them to us tomorrow.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think we must have the facts. I shall introduce a resolution tomorrow authorizing a committee to ascertain the facts and report back to the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator from Indiana for yielding.

Mr. President, when I first heard about the broadcast concerning Utah, I paid no more attention to it than I have paid to things which I have heard all my life about Utah. But when I realized, as the Senator went on with his story, that this broadcast covered the entire country, and that the entire country is considered in exactly the same light manner that the State of Utah and the people of Utah are used to being considered, I wondered about it.

Now I am wondering very seriously how a great organization such as the National Broadcasting System could take money from the Government of the United States for what it has given out to the world about the country which sustains it, and about the people who pay good money to keep that great corporation alive.

Another thing I wonder about is whether anyone in the State Department who is responsible for the administration of the law affecting that Department can so thoughtlessly make a contract without providing for any sort of follow-up—as has been proved to have been the case in this instance. If, for example, the persons who are gathering intelligence throughout the world for the United States, so that the United States can be informed about what the world is thinking and doing, are so ignorant as to accept as true the statements made in the broadcasts which have just been read to us—this drivel, as it has been called—and accept it as the true story of American history and of American geography and of American life, can we depend upon them for anything? If, for example, as the Senator from Indiana has pointed out, in the program relating to the State of Utah the broadcast presents a description of it as a State which, according to the broadcast story, is idealistically practicing what we call communism, and if, according to the broadcast, there is no government in Utah that is run by the people, and if it is said that taxation there is a matter of donation, and that a single will controls the entire State—if the representatives of the State Department have that notion of communism—how in the wide world can we believe anything they say about communism in Russia or anywhere else?

Mr. President, certainly the members of the State Department who advise us in regard to foreign matters cannot be depended upon if they do things or permit the doing of things such as those we have heard about in connection with these broadcasts—a performance based upon ignorance. If such ignorance is manifested again and again, how in the wide world can the Senate of the United States and the people of the United States have any faith at all in what they learn from such sources about any other country?

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, the Senator's point or observation is that if the State Department knows no more about what is occurring in other countries in the world than it does about what is occurring in the State of Utah or the State of Alabama or the State of Texas—as indicated by these broadcasts—then how can we believe anything they tell us? Is that the Senator's point?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course. If those upon whom we depend engage in such activities, then the whole foundation we have in regard to accepting anything from them on trust falls. That is the serious aspect of this matter.

Mr. President, the Voice of America was established upon a platform of idealism based upon the notion that millions of American people have found in this country what they want in the way of government, and that in the United States we have more or less made a success in achieving the things the people of the world have striven to accomplish. But now we find that we have told them in words of this kind what we have done.

Mr. President, I wonder whether anyone in a foreign country who is debating whether he should join the Communist Party—someone in Italy, or perhaps a person in some other country—has heard programs such as the one we have learned about today, and I wonder whether such persons believe that what they are told in such programs are correct statements about how democracy works in the United States—as told by America itself, as told by one of our great corporations, as told by our own State Department. If so, how in the world could such a person fail to decide to be a Communist under those circumstances, and can we doubt that anyone who believed such statements would decide to have nothing to do with the kind of democracy which is reflected by such broadcasts?

Mr. President, the saddest part of this matter is not only that the broadcasts are based upon ignorance, not only that they are untrue, but that the State Department itself makes an excuse, saying, "The Congress of the United States insisted that we use the going facilities of the country."

What businessman would sponsor a program of that sort and pay out money for advertising his own business if that sort of stuff were used as the advertising? The Senator from Indiana represents a great concern that advertises to a very large extent. Would the Senator from Indiana like to be a sponsor of such a program and pay $1,000 a minute for it?

But, Mr. President, the sad part of all this is that every man, woman, and child in the United States is hurt by such programs, which supposedly are sent out to benefit our country and to make democracy more secure, and $27,000,000 has been spent for these purposes. Yet today the House of Representatives is holding up a Federal aid-to-education bill because it is claimed that it costs too much.

Are there not some minds in the State Department or some minds in the National Broadcasting Co., if that company is responsible for these programs, with a sound feeling of responsibility for carrying out a contract and not wasting the money of all the people of the United States and at the same time blackmailing millions upon millions of people?

Mr. President, the Voice of America program, which was established on a basis of realism, has suffered tremendously from this accidental issuing of a contract to what has been considered to be a great and responsible concern. Yet that concern states as an answer and as an excuse that the Congress insisted that the going facilities of the country be used.

It was long ago that the Senator from Utah asked questions about these programs, because he heard about them. It was long ago that representatives of the group responsible for the programs talked to me about them. But it did not dawn on me how serious the situation was.

Mr. President, those of us who have been trained to be teachers—and the Voice of America should be handled by teachers—have been taught from the very beginning that the attempt to mold the minds and thoughts of young people is a very serious undertaking. If there is not enough psychology and not enough pedagogy and not enough understanding of American history in the State

Department to enable it properly to supervise such matters, then all we are doing and all we are spending and all that our people are sacrificing in keeping components of our Army abroad will be useless. What will the people of any foreign country think of an American soldier after listening to a program of that kind? What will they think he is trying to represent? What will they think of one of the diplomatic or other representatives of our country anywhere? Mr. President, we simply cannot believe that any agency of the United States Government would allow such a thing to happen.

I trust that what the Senator from Indiana has done will result in having those who are concerned with these programs obtain a clear understanding of the intent of Congress and in having corrections made, so that the Voice of America will no longer be used for such useless expenditures of money, but henceforth will be used for the purpose for which it was created.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, what has occurred on the floor of the Senate today—the reading of the transcript of these broadcasts; this tragic event for the United States—is not a reflection upon the Congress of the United States or upon the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate or upon its staff. The details of these contracts are not a part of its work. It is the responsibility of the State Department.

Last fall I had occasion to look critically at some broadcasts to Europe. They reflected upon the State Department. I talked over the matter with members of the organization concerned, and they assured me that the State Department set the pattern for these broadcasts and established the broad policy, and that the broadcasting companies were compelled to follow the directions of the State Department.

Today we learn that in February the broadcasts which have been read by the Senator from Indiana were made. When I first interrupted the Senator from Indiana, to ask a question about the broadcasts, my purpose was to ascertain the names of the persons or the supervisors who were responsible for them, so as to learn whether the State Department, through its facilities, monitors these broadcasts and knows what is going on.

Mr. President, when this matter is called to the attention of the State Department there are many questions that must necessarily be answered by it to the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, when the Voice of America was under consideration in the House on January 19, 1948, and the question arose as to what Congress had a right to expect would be done in foreign broadcasts through the Voice of America, Mr. MUNDT, speaking in the House, said, as appears from page 316 of the RECORD:

> Mr. MUNDT. These voices, as you call them, will be selected by the Department of State under the Secretary of State, Mr. Marshall, and the program will be administered by personnel cleared and checked by the FBI before it is utilized. The so-called Mundt loyalty amendment which we have put in all of our foreign-aid and assistance bills, since our unfortunate experiences with UNRRA, is made an inherent part of H. R. 3342. I made sure of that before I ever introduced the legislation.

Mr. MUNDT further said:

> And for the first time, too, when and where we need to use it we shall have an arm of our Government able and adequate to answer and refute slanderous falsehoods about us and to expose the fallacies and motives of vicious propaganda directed against us and our way of life. We will now be prepared to wage a peace just as we must be prepared to wage a war should necessity arise.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to repeat briefly for the benefit of the able senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Voice of America broadcast about his State.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Before the Senator repeats the broadcast about Texas, I should like to ask a question. I entered the Chamber during the course of this discussion, and I did not hear the early part of it. I should like to inquire whether the broadcasts which have been referred to took place prior to the appointment and confirmation of Mr. Allen, the present supervisor of these programs.

Mr. CAPEHART. The one on Utah was dated February 2, 1948, the one on Colorado, February 9, 1948. The one I am about to repeat for the benefit of the able Senator from Texas was dated December 15, 1947. The others were made within the last 4 or 5 months.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, no excuse can be offered for any ridiculous, unjustified broadcast going out of the State Department or going out of any agency with which it has a contract. We had many complaints last fall and during the winter in regard to the Voice of America program. Growing out of those things, a joint congressional committee was appointed, which visited all over Europe last September and October in an effort to correct the situation and to justify an authorization for an increased appropriation.

The State Department brought back Mr. Allen, who was, I think, our Ambassador to Iran at the time, and put him in charge of the work. It was generally agreed by everybody that in view of his experience he was probably the best qualified man to do this.

I think the broadcasts to which the Senator refers were made prior to the taking over of this function in the State Department by Mr. Allen. I do not say that by way of justification, but I do say it in view of the fact that he undertook and has undertaken since he took charge to correct the situation. I do not know on just what day he took charge, but it was since February, because his appointment was confirmed by this session of the Congress, I think, the latter part of February or March. I do not recall the date, and I am not sure just when he came back and took charge of that work in the State Department.

I think he has made a sincere effort since he has been in charge to correct whatever deficiencies or mistakes may have developed in the service prior to his appointment. All of which, though, I repeat, offers no justification for any such broadcasts, which seek to belittle the States of the United States, to be carried either by the State Department direct or by the National Broadcasting Co., or by any other company, when we are making an effort to educate the people of the world in regard to democracy in America.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall repeat the portion of the Texas broadcast for the benefit of the able Senator from Texas. This was broadcast on December 15, 1947:

> Sounds: Cowboys yip, yipping.
>
> Narrator: This is the traditional yell of the man of the plains, the true civilizer of Texas!
>
> Voice II: Do you mean to say that bandits really exist here?
>
> Narrator: I have told you that Texas is the State of miracles. An American writer has made this statement: "New England was founded by hypocrisy and Texas * * * by sin."

Mr. President, that was broadcast to the peoples throughout the world.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator know the name of the author of that script?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know, but it was prepared under the auspices of the Secretary of State's office, and broadcast by NBC, as the Voice of America program, for which the Congress appropriated $27,000,000. While the Senator was out of the Chamber, I read in their entirety broadcasts on Utah, Nevada, Alabama, and Pennsylvania. Thus far I have failed to find a single State that has not been slandered, or a single State as to which uncomplimentary remarks have not been made.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator, the State Department, or the National Broadcasting Co., or whatever little insignificant tool of either one of them uttered that sentence has libeled and slandered a State that during World War II furnished proportionately more volunteers than any other State in the Union and contributed as much as any other State toward the national defense in the prosecution of the war.

The author, who evidently knows nothing about the history of Texas, slandered and libeled the great Commonwealth from which I come. Let him read the history of Texas. It reads like a romance, and is a romance. American pioneers moved into Mexico and settled there, building their homes. They did not go there to foment revolution. The revolution in Texas was headed by Stephen F. Austin and others. One of their battle cries expressed a desire to live under Mexican rule. They demanded that Santa Anna, the dictator who had taken over the reins of the Mexican Government, abide by the Mexican constitution of 1824. They wanted to

live under the republic to which they had immigrated, but they wanted their constitutional rights. When they were unable to secure those rights and were invaded by hostile armies they drew their swords and fought valiantly and bravely until they attained their independence, after shedding their blood and pouring out their scanty treasure in a great conflict.

What has been the history of Texas since that time? For 9 years it was an independent republic. It had its ambassadors in Washington and in foreign countries. It held its head high for 9 long years and maintained its independence, though attacked on two occasions by Mexico and invaded by hostile armies. The Texans repelled them, driving them back. Finally they joined the Union in 1845.

What contribution did Texas make then to the Union? As a result of the admission of the State of Texas there followed the Mexican War, whose results brought within the domain of the Union that great territory stretching all the way to California and up the Pacific Coast to the place where the waters of the Columbia mingle with the waters of the Pacific. Thus there was brought under the flag of the Union a vast region dedicated to Anglo-Saxon civilization and to the constitutional concept of free government and democracy and the parliamentary system.

That, Mr. President, is the story of Texas. Why did not the author base his script on that, instead of digging up filth and falsehood?

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me read the Senator two or three more paragraphs. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. CAPEHART. The narrator says:

> Texas, individual in everything, was not conquered by soldiers nor by priests.
>
> Man I: By whom, then?
>
> Narrator: By 600 cows with their respective bulls.
>
> (Narrator then relates how Don Juan de Onate arrived in El Paso in 1598 with a large entourage and herd of cattle.) In less than 80 years the cows, with the help of the bulls—

Now, mind you, Mr. President, this was broadcast in Spanish throughout the world.

> In less than 80 years the cows, with the help of the bulls, of course, transformed Texas into the center of the cattle industry.

Now, how could the State be slandered in a worse way than by those statements, I ask the able Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that the entire script, evidently—I have not read it all—is a libel on the State of Texas. I thank the Senator for calling it to my attention.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me say, please, I have read into the RECORD the Voice of America broadcasts on three or four States, and each of the States has been libeled. The States have been laughed at, they have been made to seem ridiculous, just as has the State of Texas. For example, Alabama—I do not have the broadcast here, but the State of Alabama was possibly more wantonly libeled than was the State of Texas. The statement concerning the State of Alabama, the city of Birmingham, and the capital, the city of Montgomery, was a ridiculous one.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will introduce a resolution and have it referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I shall be very much pleased, as a member of the committee, to consider it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know the Senator from Texas dislikes this sort of thing as much as I do. He would not, by any stretch of the imagination, willingly permit any such programs to be broadcast.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that when the question first arose in the Committee on Foreign Relations as to the establishment of the Voice of America, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the senior Senator from Texas expressed very serious doubts about giving this tremendous power to any bureau of the Government. We did not anticipate such vile and baseless slanders as those which the Senator has revealed today. We did fear irresponsible broadcasts by some little two-by-four employee of some department who might think he had to write something and broadcast it to the world. Our worst fears have been more than realized with respect to this program. They had better not send anything than to send such trash as this. They had better close up their doors and keep quiet than to plaster all over the world these slanderous, outrageous stories regarding the different States of the Union. I do not know who the individual is who wrote it, but I will say that he has my utter contempt, and, I am sure, the contempt of the Senate for writing such matter.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall introduce a resolution tomorrow calling for an inquiry, and I hope it will be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator read a sentence which said that New England was founded in hypocrisy.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did.

Mr. BREWSTER. Have any representatives from New England had an opportunity to comment on that broadcast?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The statement was that New England was founded in hypocrisy and Texas in sin.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to supplement what has been said by observing that we shall need to redecorate the Capitol, because in the rotunda there is a very impressive mural showing the Founding Fathers assembled on the deck of the *Speedwell*, which is an historic error. They finally arrived on the *Mayflower*. But they are conducting a church service and reading the Bible.

On one side of the President's robing room there will be found a mural depicting the founders of America, the leader of the Pilgrim Fathers bearing a somewhat distinguished name. They are shown reading the Holy Bible.

I should suggest that if this characterization be correct, we might ask the same gentlemen to rewrite our history and to redecorate our Capitol accordingly.

The leader of the Pilgrim Fathers left England because he would have been hanged for his religious beliefs if he had remained. He was ready to sacrifice life itself for the things in which he believed. He was a refugee for some time, but finally escaped from England in the *Mayflower* and landed on what were at that time the inhospitable shores of New England, in search of religious liberty. Those who characterize as hypocrites those men and women, many of whom laid down their lives in the first winter of their residence in New England, are worthy of language which I think this Chamber would not deem it best to entertain.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not think any Senator needs to defend his State against these charges. A thought occurs to me which has not been brought out. As I have listened to the reading of the so-called broadcasts affecting each State I could not escape the opinion that either some wit wanted to have some fun at the expense of the United States Government, or someone deliberately wanted to present the United States Government to foreign countries in a very bad light. What interests me about it is that it is not merely a "happenstance"; it looks like a calculated attempt to portray the United States in the most degrading way that radio technique would permit.

I shall be very much interested in knowing who prepared the script. I do not think we need to defend our States in the Senate, but I should be interested in knowing who sat down deliberately and prepared such a script, unless he was a consummate joker or a person who did not believe in America.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I promised to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I was present at a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations when the Senator from Indiana read the broadcast relating to the State of Alabama. I did not hear the contents of the broadcast, but they have been brought to my attention since I left the committee and returned to the floor. I simply want to characterize that broadcast, its contents, and its statements, as base slander. The entire broadcast is such a tissue of falsehoods that I shall not dignify it by any detailed answer. As one who has the honor in part of representing the people of the State of Alabama in this body, I do want to express my deep resentment over this broadcast and to express my profound contempt for the author of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the body of the RECORD the broadcast on the State of Colorado, because I shall not take the time to read it. I shall introduce a resolution tomorrow asking that it be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee to make a thorough inquiry into how such a ridiculous thing could happen in one of the departments of the Government.

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

KNOW NORTH AMERICA—COLORADO

Music: Theme, up and under.

Announcer: The National Broadcasting Co. presents Know North America, a weekly program in which we narrate the spiritual adventures of two travelers as they discover the numerous miracles of the historical and present-day life of the United States.

Train whistle, sounds, etc.

Voice: (Yawns.)

Narrator: What is the matter; are you bored?

Voice: Naturally.

Narrator: You have nothing to complain about; you are traveling like royalty.

Voice: Yes, that is true, but, the trouble is that we do not stop at any place.

Voice II: We are like three errant Jews.

Voice: Who are not even Jews.

Voice II: We are living the life of an airmail letter.

Voice: Without a definite address.

Narrator (laughs): And what would you like—spend a season in each State?

Voice II: Not that, but it's trying to see everything and yet not be able to fully enjoy anything.

Narrator: Does that mean that you are not satisfied?

Voice: Where the captain commands, the sailor has no say.

Voice II: Do you think it was right that we only spent 2 days in Hollywood?

Narrator: No; but I believe I showed you everything; the only thing you did not see was the cemetery of Forest Lawn, where there are no tombstones, only trees with names.

Voice: What do I care about such artistic cemeteries!

Voice II: The quickest journey that we have made, a real record, was the one through Nevada.

[Laughter.]

Voice: You delivered the historic lecture to us on the plane and we did not stop.

Voice II: Don't you think that the State is going to resent it?

Narrator: Perhaps, but it was not my fault. The plane took another route. But don't worry, remember what John Barrymore said: "In the world there are two cities which every civilized man should visit, even though only once—Paris and Reno."

Voice: I have not visited either of them.

Voice II: Because you are not civilized.

Sound, train up and again in background.

Voice: What magnificent forests.

Voice II: They are endless.

Narrator: In the West 70 percent of the land is forests and deserts.

Voice: And yet the United States has 140,000,000 inhabitants.

Narrator: They could have 500——

Voice II: Look, we have entered Colorado.

Voice (reading): Mesa Verde, Colo.

Narrator: Prepare yourself to see the most admirable landscapes in the world. There are no equals, not even in Switzerland.

Voice: This looks like one of those Christmas cards.

Voice II: A forest of blue pines.

Narrator: Mesa Verde is a national park where the ruins of the prehistoric cities of the cavemen are preserved. In these virgin lands there are buffalo, deer, mountain goats, and bears——

Voice (suddenly): What a coincidence; there are two there.

Voice II: With what interest they look at the train.

Narrator: They are so tame that they stop the tourists' automobiles and beg for bread.

Voice: Rather dangerous beggars.

Narrator: Yes; one must be careful because with the bread they might take your arm.

(Train up and down again.)

Narrator: Nothing in the United States is comparable to Colorado.

Voice II: I won't know with regard to other things, but as far as picturesqueness, this is unique.

Narrator: In the State of Colorado there are 1,500 peaks over 10,000 feet above sea level; and of the 66 in the United States higher than 14,000 feet, 55 are in Colorado.

Voice: Then, this is nothing but mountains?

Narrator: No; on the other side are the plains and the deserts. That peak, covered with fog, is Lookout Mountain. Buffalo Bill, one of the most interesting characters in the history of the West, is buried there. His tomb looks toward the east, toward the vast plains where he was the terror of the redskins and the buffalo * * *.

Voice: When I was young I never liked Buffalo Bill.

Narrator: That is strange, because his adventures are enthusiastically read by all youngsters.

Voice: I always took the side of the Indians and the buffalo.

Voice II: Both suffered tremendously, but that's progress: It destroys in order to build.

Narrator: You may not believe it, but today, according to statistics, there are more Indians than before colonization.

Voice II: But there are no more buffalo.

Voice: Of course, since no one eats Indians.

(Train into.)

(Man calling "Denver—Denver." Station sounds.)

Narrator: We have arrived. Don't forget the suitcase.

Voice: I suppose we will rest here.

Narrator: Only what is strictly necessary to continue the trip.

(Sounds up and under.)

Narrator: Denver, the capital of Colorado, is situated at the foothills of the Rocky Mountains. It is the highest city in the country, and its air, clear and clean, gives life and optimism to the inhabitants. Colorado no doubt is the most spectacular State in the United States. Its principal sources of wealth are cattle in all its ramifications—gold, silver, beet sugar—even tourists.

(Street noises, voices, etc., in background).

Voice II: What a large number of Mexicans we see here.

Narrator: In Denver alone there are 25,000.

Voice: This belonged to Mexico, isn't that true?

Narrator: And to France and to Texas, when the audacity of Sam Houston made him decide to extend his republic.

Voice: Where does the State take its name from?

Narrator: From the most important of its rivers, which the Spanish Conquistadores called the Colorado because of the reddish color of its waters.

Voice II: The gold and the silver rush began here after the one in California. Am I right?

Narrator: Yes, in 1860. But it was not until 1900 that the adventure became an industry, maintaining its splendor throughout the First World War.

Voice II: What history of the West: extravagant, heroic, and cruel.

Narrator: The strangest thing is that the furtherest States, like California and Nevada, were the ones that were colonized first.

Voice: Why would that be?

Narrator: The adventurers saw the great plains and rushed toward them until the Pacific stopped them.

Voice II: Those who followed in their footsteps were probably more conservative.

Narrator: That is it exactly, according to historian James Truslow Adams, who says: "The men on horseback would swallow the horizon but the families traveled in ox-drawn carts and slowly were strewn along the way."

(Electric street car, very noisy, voices, etc.)

Narrator: The people from Colorado feel great pride in saying that Denver is the summit of the United States.

Voice II: Geographically?

Narrator: Naturally. Can you notice how distinctly you can hear the noises?

Voice: Yes; especially the one that the electric street cars make.

Narrator (laughs): They belong to an English company.

Voice: I thought so.

Voice II: For the rest, Denver is a quiet city.

Narrator: But don't think that it was always like this: it had its days of glory and scandal.

Voice: When the gold rush broke the thermometer?

Narrator: Yes. At that time it was an international coquette. Nevertheless, when gold disappeared it recovered its former calm and became a moderate industrial community.

Voice II: What it is today.

Narrator: When gold was exhausted miners continued to dig the earth desperately and instead of the golden or silver metal they found the most common and blackest mineral.

Voice II: Coal?

Narrator: Yes. According to statistics, there is enough coal in Colorado for 7,000 years.

Voice: They better consume it now because by that time people will get heat from atomic radiations.

Music: Up and under. Somewhat sad.

(A burro brays.)

Voice: Listen, what a cordial greeting! It has been a long time since I have seen one of those compatriots!

[Laughter.]

Voice: Compatriot? Colleague!

Voice II: Is this a city?

Narrator: It was; and not just any city but a real metropolis.

Voice: Metropolis, when almost all the houses are made of wood?

Narrator: What does that matter? There was more gold here than in many marble palaces.

Voice II: Modern ruins, are they not?

Narrator: Truly a paradox!

Voice: You know what this looks like? One of those studio sets that we saw in Hollywood.

Voice II: That's true.

Narrator: And it really had much of that. It was so fantastic and transitory!

(Suddenly.) Look out!

(Heavy board falls.)

Voice: That wall almost flattened me!

Narrator: You should thank God that it is made of wood.

Voice: Yes; but I am made of bone and flesh.

Voice II: More bone than flesh.

(Steps on stone.)

Voice: (Echo.) Hello! This used to be a theater. Isn't that right?

Narrator: And what a theater. The most famous opera and dramatic companies used to come here. On this stage Gladys Swarthout sang the Merry Widow and Walter Houston and Ruth Gordon presented Othello and the Doll House.

Voice: Then the miners were not so ignorant if they appreciated Shakespeare and Ibsen!

(Steps.)

Narrator (off): Come and see the legend.

Voice: What is happening to you? Are you forgetting Spanish? Legends are read or they are told.

Narrator: But the one that I want to show you, you can see.

(Door opens.)

Voice: This is very old.

Voice II: It has the odor of centuries.

Narrator: And yet this city was founded 70 years ago, when the mine of Central City was discovered—and a few days after it was born it began to die, little by little.

(Steps on wood.)

Voice II (reading): The Teller House.

Narrator: This used to be a hotel and very famous cabaret.

Voice: Well, where is the legend?

Narrator: On the floor. Look at it.

Voice: A woman's head.

Narrator: One night, during the golden great days, a vagabond entered here and, with a piece of chalk, painted that face.

Voice II: Oh, I remember the legend. I saw it in a movie.

Narrator: The man, once he had finished, screamed, and fell dead on his work.

Voice: Then that is authentic?

Narrator: Naturally. A newspaperman wrote a ballad, famous and in poor taste, entitled "The Face on the Bar Room Floor."

Music: Music, nostalgic. Sound of car running.

Voice II: What a magnificent type of Indian. He looks like a prince.

Narrator: And probably he is. The Utes, the aristocrats of the Indian tribes of Colorado, live in this region.

Voice II: Oh, those are the indomitable.

Narrator: Yes; the Utes, like the Araucanos in Chile, were never conquered either by the Spaniards or the French.

Voice: Nor by the Texans?

Narrator: Not by them either. Nevertheless, the fact that they would not submit to anyone isolated them and therefore they do not form part of the active life in Colorado, like other tribes which, surrendering to the conquerers, acquired their defects and virtues.

Voice II: In a way they are a monument.

Narrator. Yes. They are not taken into consideration but they are respected as a symbol of the heroism of the race.

Voice II: Which in this region is formidable. Isn't that right?

Narrator: Of course it is. The prototype is Jack Dempsey, terrible mixtures of Irish, Indian, and Mexican.

Music. Grandiose. Car running, up and to BG.

Voice II: What activity one sees everywhere.

Narrator: Colorado is one of the richest States in the Union, but it is only now, after the war, that it has started its progress on a large scale because most of the capital is in the hands of the daughters, granddaughters or great-granddaughters of the miners of the past century.

Voice II: And of course, the ladies are conservative and they don't wish to let go of what they have.

Voice: Like all women.

Music: Up and under.

Narrator: To the natives, Colorado is not just a State. It is something like a religion and, to a certain extent, their pride is justified since geographically it has no equal in the United States; and in few parts of the world. Colorado is half mountain and half plain. The peaks erupt rugged, violent from the plains and at some places there is not more than 100 kilometers between the most arid desert and the summit of the Rocky Mountains. Colorado has not only produced gold, silver, and coal, but also great artists like Harold Lloyd, Ernest Truex, Frederic March, and the unforgettable Douglas Fairbanks.

Music: Up and out.

Announcer: You have just heard Know North America, a weekly program in which we narrate the spiritual adventures of two travelers as they discover the numerous miracles of the historical and present-day life of the United States. Participating in this program were * * *. Juan José Vasquez was in charge of production and direction.

Music: Up and out.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Since my colloquy I have learned that Mr. Allen, the present head of the division of the State Department having to do with this subject, was confirmed by the Senate on the 31st of March of this year and took office sometime after that date.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] hands me a document which indicates that Mr. Allen was confirmed on the 25th of February. I think he took office sometime after the 1st of April, which would indicate——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I did not want to leave the impression that these broadcasts happened since Mr. Allen took office.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am very much interested, because I was a member of the joint committee which visited Europe and looked into the broadcasts from America. We came back convinced that the service was needed in order to combat the propaganda against the United States in that quarter of the world. I recall that when the hearings were in progress before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the question of using existing facilities instead of broadcasting directly from the State Department was under consideration, the question arose as to the extent of supervision which should be exercised by the State Department over the broadcasting companies.

It was represented, I recall, that the broadcasting companies objected to State Department supervision on the ground that they would not be free agents to send out over their systems this information as they themselves prepared it.

I do not know, but I should like to know, and I hope the Senator from New Jersey in his inquiry of the State Department will ascertain, to what extent they exercised supervision and control over these private companies which disseminated this misinformation, and to what extent, if at all, there has been any change in the method of supervision, or any change in the type of contract made between the State Department and these broadcasting companies, any one or all of them.

I am sure that the Senator from New Jersey will undertake, even without a resolution or any action on the part of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to obtain every detail of the information so that the Senate and the country may know.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that I have requested that information, and if it is not adequate when it is received, we will get more information, so that every last corner of this distressful situation will be explored.

Mr. CAPEHART. In the inquiry we should make we should call in the writers and the authors and those who prepared the script, and ascertain under what circumstances the scripts were prepared.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator completely, because the tone of those broadcasts indicates that there certainly was a malicious intent in putting out information of that kind. I cannot condemn it too severely, and I thank the Senator from Indiana for bringing the matter to our attention.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have a copy of the letter of one of the authors of the script, which I am not at liberty at the moment to place in the RECORD, in which she in substance says that she was forced to write this sort of thing.

Mr. SMITH. I think we should investigate that very promptly.

Mr. CAPEHART. I may get permission later to put the letter in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Permit me to say to the Senator from Indiana that if and when his resolution is offered, and it comes to the Committee on Foreign Relations——

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall present it tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. As one member of that committee, I shall insist not only that we have the officials of the State Department before us, but that we have the National Broadcasting Co. representative called.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is right, as well as the persons who wrote the copy.

Mr. CONNALLY. So that we can put our fingers on the copy and identify the source of it. It seems to me, as suggested by the Senator from New Jersey, that this whole matter is saturated with malice, with malice aforethought, in order to vent the spleen and pour out the venom of the authors of this stuff upon certain States and sections of the country. The idea that anyone, even one with a distorted mind, would conceive of sending out that kind of material to the detriment of the United States. These people are paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They are supposed to serve their country. They are supposed to wear the uniform of the United States. Yet they are saboteurs, they are traitors to their country and to the cause which they are supposed to represent.

Mr. CAPEHART. I hope the inquiry will go into every phase of the situation.

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

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

Mr. McMAHON. I have asked the Senator to yield because I looked up the date when Mr. Allen actually took over this program, and I find it to have been March 30, 1948.

I might say to the Senator that only those who so deeply believe, as I believe, in the necessity of America's voice, the true voice of America, being known to the world, could feel as deeply shamed and abashed at the kind of statements which have been voiced in the scripts

which the Senator from Indiana has read. I am one of those who have heretofore voiced my belief that unless the United States of America succeeds in putting its case—and a great case it has—to the rest of the world, we will inevitably lose the battle for men's minds that is going on between us and the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, that is why I, perhaps as much as any other Member of the Senate, deplore this kind of broadcast, because I am afraid that the malfeasance in this office, if you please, might result in such condemnation as to result in the abolition of the office itself, which I think would be a very bad thing for the United States.

What we must do is to see that this does not happen again, but we must also resolve that we shall go forward to place America's case, what America stands for, the freedom it stands for, what America lives by, and what America is willing to die by, before the people of the world.

Mr. CAPEHART. What a tragedy it would have been had someone not called the attention of the Senate to the kind and type of broadcasts which are being made, and if it had been continued in foreign languages over a period of months and months and years and years.

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

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

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest that ascertaining the author of the script and perhaps reprimanding the author or securing his dismissal from the Government service will amount to very little, and will probably correct nothing. The State Department, and the State Department alone, is responsible for the type of broadcasts which go out over the world under this program. I think the Congress has spent too much time in running down subordinates, getting sensational stories about subordinates, and then doing nothing about the department heads who are responsible for the subordinates. That is why I wish to point out that just so long as we devote our effort to running down subordinates of a department and do not take any action against the heads of the departments who are responsible for the acts of the employees, just so long will we have contributed very little toward better government. I hope that in this case at least action may be taken. I think we have to hold the department heads responsible if we are to get good Government service.

I realize that we have circumscribed the scope of the department heads in some cases by legislation so that they cannot function properly. If that be true, we should correct that situation, too. But, above all else, if we do not hold the department top levels themselves responsible, we will never correct the evil things which happen on the lower levels.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am certain that public hearings will be held by the Committee on Foreign Relations on this question and on the resolution which I shall offer tomorrow.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I feel that the Senator from Vermont has very clearly stated a point I had intended to mention, namely, that, regardless of who may have written the particular scripts which have been laid before the Senate, which have revealed a situation which is deplorable, and, I may say, tragic—regardless of who may have written them, the State Department, under whose direction and guidance they were written, is the responsible Government agency, and must answer for the acts. I think it is very well indeed to ascertain what individual may have written the scripts, and find from that individual why they were written and who authorized their writing.

Much has been said about the time Mr. Allen took office and began to perform his duties in charge of the Voice of America program. From the information given us today it appears he took office on March 30 of this year. That is not the question, however. Some one was there in that department before March 30, responsible, and solely responsible, I feel, for the conduct of the program. Inquiry should be made as to why this kind of broadcast was made; what motivated it. There could have been no good motive behind it. Why then should anyone in the Government service direct broadcasts or statements so injurious to the country? That ought to be the real purpose of the investigation. I hope it will proceed at once.

Mr. MALONE obtained the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of submitting a conference report?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I may say to the Senator from Nevada that I am sure consideration of it will require but a few minutes.

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota for that purpose.

WOMEN'S CORPS IN THE ARMED SERVICES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 1641, to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, and so forth, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see p. 6958 of the House proceedings in the RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

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

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the conference report is unanimous on the part of the managers of the Senate and of the House. It deals with a bill passed by the Senate last year, on July 27, 1947, authorizing a regular enlistment in the WAVES, the WAC, and the Marines. The bill as it has been agreed to in conference comes so near to the Senate version that I do not think it will require a long explanation. The passage of the Unification Act and the Promotion Act, after the passage of this bill, made necessary quite a number of amendments so as to make the bill in harmony with those two laws. None of the changes made necessary in terminology and procedure actually affect the substance of the Senate bill as it was originally passed. The original House version did not provide for any regular corps of women officers or enlisted women in any of the three services. That was an integral part of the Senate bill as we passed it.

As a result of the conference the regular corps remains at the same strength as originally approved by the Senate. The bill, as amended in conference, however, requires that the full enlistment in the regular corps shall be attained in a time period of 2 years rather than all at once. I believe this to be an entirely sound procedure which is intended to apply to the three services, because full enlistment could not be taken care of administratively all at once. Therefore the Senate conferees have agreed on the changes made in the bill.

I can assure the Senate that the bill as it now is is identical with the substance and intent of the Senate version.

I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to say for the RECORD and for the information of Senators present that it is our hope to finish action on the displaced-persons bill tomorrow.

Further, it has already been agreed, by unanimous consent, to set aside the time from 12 o'clock to 3:30 p. m. on Friday next to deal with the conference report on what is commonly known as the Reed-Bulwinkle bill.

Following action on that measure it is our hope to take up the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill.

I appeal to Members of the Senate to be present tomorrow, and let us vote on the amendments proposed to the displaced-persons bill, and get that legislation out of the way if possible by tomorrow night.

REVISION OF ROLL OF INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives anouncing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2878) to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BUTLER. This being a bill which came from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appoint Mr. BUTLER,

Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ECTON, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. MURRAY conferees on the part of the Senate.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a telegram I received this afternoon from Mr. Richard Kleberg, familiarly known as Dick Kleberg, of the King ranch in Texas. I think possibly he sent it to the chairman of the Small Business Committee because of the interest we took a year ago in the question of OPA controls. He also knows we were very much interested, together with the Department of Agriculture and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and other Senators, in the matter of the appropriations which were made for the control of foot-and-mouth disease, as it related to cattle across the border. I read the telegram for the information of Senators because Mr. Kleberg asked that I read it in full. I have made protest to the Department of Agriculture in connection with it, but I think the matter is of so much importance that Senators from the livestock areas of the United States should be informed respecting its contents. Mr. Kleberg's telegram says:

Carl Svarverud, address Roswell Hotel, Del Rio, Tex., sent me the following telegram—

Which in turn was sent on to me—

Boston wool buyers bidding on 1,000,000 pounds Coahuila wool. BAI will permit entrance through Eagle Pass.

Following is part of the telegram I do not understand. It is:

Relative to Aftosa quarantine.

I am told that that means the hoof-and-mouth-disease quarantine, but it is a code word I am not able to understand. However, I have referred the telegram, as I said, to the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Kleberg says further:

These shipments are a definite threat to the livestock industry. Twenty-two carloads of meat scraps partially cooked, three carloads of dry bones consigned to Consolidated Chemical Co., of San Francisco, are contemplated to be shipped through Eagle Pass.

The telegram continues:

Suggest that you and other Senators file protest immediately demanding embargo on such shipments.

Before calling this matter to the attention of the Senate I took it up with the section in the Department of Agriculture which has charge of enforcing the quarantine in connection with the foot-and-mouth disease as it relates to the restricted areas. I talked to a Dr. Seher, who I think is well informed respecting the provisions of the act. He said that Coahuila wool comes from live sheep and is processed in transit in such manner as to render it safe. Of course I am not pitting my judgment against his, but I have taken the matter up with Mr. Kleberg and he says the difficulty is that the wool is being collected in regions which are outside districts which have been freed from the disease in Mexico, and that there is a great chance that in this million pounds of wool there will be found wool which has come from an infected area.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Like the Senator from Nebraska, I am not an expert on the subject. Did the individual to whom the Senator referred say the wool itself was processed?

Mr. WHERRY. He said that the wool from live sheep is processed in transit. How that is done I do not know. But between the time it leaves its point of origin and until it arrives at Boston, if there is any processing to be done it is done in transit, and the wool is supposed to be free from any foot-and-mouth infection.

Possibly it is true that wool could be safely released from quarantine and imported into this country if it came only from the areas which are free from foot-and-mouth disease. But Mr. Kleberg says that there is a question in the minds of many as to whether it can be processed and made free from disease which might spread in this country. Furthermore, he states that to his knowledge this wool is not being assembled only in districts freed from foot-and-mouth disease, but that it comes from all districts, and is then shipped as Coahuila wool. He feels that it is a dangerous threat to the livestock industry of the country.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not an expert on that particular disease, but my information is that the germ or virus, or whatever it is, can be transmitted on clothing, or any other article.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that be true, there is great danger in permitting this wool to come across the border. It may bring the germ with it.

Mr. WHERRY. When I called with reference to the meat scraps, I was told that they were partially cooked. I understand that if they have gone through a heat process, that is supposed to destroy the germs; yet I am told that much of this meat is only partially cooked, and that it is not free from disease. Those who have been employed to investigate the question are apprehensive that scrap meat infested with foot-and-mouth disease is being imported by the carload. I asked how these shipments were sent through, and was told that they are sent through consular agents on the border between Mexico and Texas. Let us say for the sake of argument that the consular agents are doing the best job they can, according to the specifications laid down. If the handling of imports into this country is anything like the handling of merchandise exported from this country, it is almost a superhuman task to supervise it adequately.

We have already appropriated $42,000,000 to control the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico and elsewhere; and no doubt this Congress would be liberal and continue to appropriate, because everyone in the livestock areas knows, as do the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and other Senators, what a dread disease it is, and what a loss it is to those whose herds must be slaughtered to eliminate the disease to keep it from spreading to our farms.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I believe the Senator stated that he had already protested to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to say for myself—and I feel sure that the same thought would be expressed by all Senators from livestock-producing States—that we are not in a position to pass upon the sufficiency of what should be done. But I am positively of the opinion that if there is any question whatever, these importations should not be allowed.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. I join the Senator in that attitude.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I am merely putting the Senate on notice, and especially Senators from States along the border, as to what is happening. I can think of no better way to make a protest than to bring the subject to the attention not only of the Department, but also of the Senators who are interested. The protest is made only in that light. I hope that from now on, if the rules are not sufficiently rigid, they will be made so. A protest has already been made. It is important that appropriations which are made to halt this disease be used judiciously. Certainly we should take no chance on importations of wool or scrap meat or bones, in view of the fact that the foot-and-mouth disease is such a dread disease, and will cause such great financial loss in the event that it is spread through shipments of this kind.

I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding to me.

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I again invite the attention of the Senate to the program for tomorrow and Friday. I hope that we can expeditiously take care of the pending legislation and conclude consideration of the Post Office-Treasury appropriation bill and the conference report on the Bulwinkle bill, which will be before us for consideration on Friday at noon, by unanimous-consent agreement.

THE MINING INDUSTRY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, many factors are responsible for the deplorable state of the mining industry at the present time.

First, unwise taxes—the siphoning off of the capital and incomes of the people of the Nation to the point that there is little venture capital left for investment in the hazardous business of mining. Mining is definitely a venture business.

Second, the Securities and Exchange Commission is retarding such investments through trying to determine the feasibility of mining ventures instead of determining the facts for the benefit of the public, relative to a stock issue.

Third, tariffs and import fees have been reduced to the point where little

protection for the workers and investors in the industry is afforded.

Fourth, the atmosphere of the "have not" nation radiated from many Government departments in Washington tends to discourage activity in the mining field.

Fifth, the announced policy of the Army and Navy Munitions Board and other bureaus responsible for the stock piling of strategic and critical minerals of favoring the purchase of foreign mineral supplies over domestic ores has further discouraged expenditure of time and money in the mining field.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am interested in the Senator's bill—certainly in its purpose. Does the Senator expect the bill to bring about an expansion in the number of domestic producing mines?

Mr. MALONE. If some stability is afforded the mining industry mining men expect that venture capital will again enter the field and develop prospects, prospectors will again be searching the mineralized area and will find more prospects, many new mines will come in, and old ones will be reopened for production.

Mr. REVERCOMB. With the intended increase in mining activity, is it the purpose of the bill to encourage stock piling of ores for defense purposes?

Mr. MALONE. That is the principal purpose. The administration is talking war. We are in a very unsettled condition. As a matter of fact, the Second World War has not as yet been declared officially over, and a large proportion of our mines have closed down. We cannot possibly stock-pile enough material with which to fight a war. We must have producing mines to augment the supply. That was proved in World War II, as a result of the submarine menace. For the first year or two of any war it is not possible to get cargoes of minerals through in sufficient amount to fight a war. About 75 percent of the cargoes in the last war were lost during the first year through submarine attack.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then the idea is to have going mines which are kept alive and working.

Mr. MALONE. That is the principal purpose.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If production is greater than need, then the idea is to stock-pile it for eventual use. Is that another purpose?

Mr. MALONE. That is entirely correct. I thank my colleague from West Virginia.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I, like the Senator from West Virginia, am interested in the bill the Senator proposes to introduce, and I am more or less familiar with its contents. It is my impression that one of the purposes of the bill is to carry out what was the intent of the Stockpiling Act of 1946.

Mr. MALONE. One particular purpose of the bill is to see that the Stockpiling Act of 1946 is carried out, and that is provided for through the RFC.

Mr. President, these and many other factors have combined to dangerously curtail the mining industry at a critical period in our history. Definite moves are under way at the present time to correct these factors, but they cannot be made effective in time to preserve the mining industry or to meet any emergency.

This, then, is not the time to discuss these policies in detail, but they will be taken up in order at a later date.

So, Mr. President, I now introduce the bill and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point. In introducing this proposed legislation I am joined by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The bill (S. 2756) to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. ECTON, Mr. CAIN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. CHAVEZ), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Minerals Development and Conservation Act of 1948."

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the policy of the Congress that every effort be made to stimulate the exploration, development, mining, and production of strategic and critical metals and minerals by private enterprise to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the United States by providing for the development and conservation of these materials in order to decrease and prevent, wherever possible, a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of such materials. To this end it is the further policy of the Congress that every effort be made to stimulate, stabilize, and maintain a sound and active mining industry within the United States and to coordinate the programs now provided for or to be provided for by law for making scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence; the development, mining preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States; and to stimulate the commercial extraction and production of the same.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created within the Department of the Interior a Mine Incentive Payments Division, hereinafter called the "Division."

(b) The administrative officers of the Division shall be a Director, suitably qualified in actual administrative and mining experience, and an Assistant Director. The salaries of the Director and Assistant Director shall be $12,000 per annum and $10,000 per annum, respectively. In the absence of the Director his duties shall be performed by the Assistant Director.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Director, and he is hereby authorized and directed, (1) to perform the functions hereinafter specifically authorized, and (2) to prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act in the simplest manner.

(d) The Director may select, employ, and fix the compensation of such engineers and other experts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923 and shall employ such other staff as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 4. All of the functions of the Office of Premium Price Plan for Copper, Lead, and Zinc, pertaining to the administration of said plan, are hereby transferred to the Division, together with all pertinent records and equipment.

SEC. 5. (a) To carry out the purposes of this act, development and conservation payments shall be made hereunder for all ores, metals, and minerals determined to be strategic or critical, pursuant to section 2 (a), Public Law 520 (79th Cong., ch. 590, 2d sess.), and included in group A of the Munitions Board list of strategic and critical materials, dated January 1948, together with any minerals or metals that subsequently may be added thereto, produced from ores, dumps, tailings, slag piles, and residues (excluding scrap materials), except that in the event that the Munitions Board shall find that further purchases of particular ores, metals, or minerals for national security stock-pile purposes are no longer necessary or shall within 1 year of the date of finding cease to be necessary, then (1) if such finding is made within 30 days after the effective date of this act, no payments shall be made under the authority of this act except in cases of small mines as hereinafter provided with respect to such ores, metals, or minerals, and (2) if such finding is made more than 30 days after the effective date of this act, no payments under the authority of this act shall be made with respect to such ores, metals, or minerals, produced after 6 months from the date of such finding, except in cases of small mines as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That in the event any such findings are amended by the Munitions Board to the effect that purchases of such ores, metals, or minerals have again become necessary for national security stock-pile purposes the payment provisions of this act shall again become applicable subject to the limitations of this paragraph. Such payments shall be made at such rates within the limitations defined in this act so as to encourage exploration and development, increase production, and effect conservation and make reasonable allowances for depreciation and depletion and shall include a reasonable profit to the producer based upon the values of all recoverable metals and minerals contained in the ores. And in cases of small mines where production in any calendar year is less than 300 tons of recoverable metal, maximum payments shall be made on total production therefrom on application and none of the restrictions other than those

of maximum-payment limitations shall govern in such cases. Exploration payments shall be made in addition to development and conservation payments without regard to payment limitations provided in this act on the following basis, viz: Maximum exploration payments shall be based on production of recoverable metal produced from each mine operation at the rate of 7 cents per pound for the first 250 tons or fraction thereof of metal produced during any calendar year; at the rate of 6 cents per pound for the second 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; 5 cents per pound for the third 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; 4 cents per pound for the fourth 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; 3 cents per pound for the fifth 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; 2 cents per pound for the sixth 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; and 1½ cents per pound for all metals produced during any calendar year in excess of 1,500 tons and less than 2,000 tons. Exploration payments shall be made monthly, provided expenditures for such work are made prior to the end of the calendar year following the year in which such allowances accrue. Exploration payments received by an operator shall be deemed gross income within the meaning of section 22, Internal Revenue Code, and all expenditures by such operator for exploration work for which exploration payments are received under this act shall be allowable as deductions under section 23, Internal Revenue Code. It shall be a condition of the making of all such payments that recipients thereof shall pay no royalties on exploration payments or on such portion of the amount received by the producer as is in excess of market prices, except where landowners share in the expense of transportation, milling, and smelting of ores.

(b) In addition to the other powers and duties created by this act, the Director may authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to enter into such contracts as would aid in effectuating the policies of this act.

SEC. 6 (a) Development and conservation payments for any particular metals or minerals shall be in addition to the amount received per unit from other sources by the producer of the metal or mineral. Such payments shall not exceed the difference between the current market price and (1) in the case of metals produced under the premium-price plan, an amount equal to the highest market price plus the production premiums received by any domestic producer during the years 1942 to 1946, inclusive, and (2) in the case of other ores, metals, and minerals an amount equal to the highest amount paid any domestic producer for such metals and minerals during the years 1942 to 1946, inclusive, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or its subsidiaries or by other Government departments or agencies, such amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) hereof to be adjusted by the Director in proportion to the changes in the Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale price index of all commodities (1926 equals 100) since such highest sums or amounts were first offered or paid. Hereafter all maximum development and conservation payments limitations provided in this section shall be adjusted by the Director in proportion to each five-point change in the Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale commodity price index of all commodities (1926 equals 100). These maximum limitations shall apply unless in the opinion of the Director special consideration is necessary for further stimulation of development or production of a particular metal or mineral. All ores, concentrates, metals, and minerals on which payments are made shall meet previously established minimum industrial specifications or minimum specifications determined by the Munitions Board for the national security stock pile.

(b) All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments and which comply with Munitions Board minimum stock-pile specifications, shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall transfer such ores, metals, and minerals to the national security stock pile established pursuant to Public Law 520 (79th Cong., ch. 590, 2d sess.): *Provided*, That any producer may deliver an equivalent quantity of recoverable metal in form and grade satisfactory to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in lieu of the particular metal or mineral resulting from payments hereunder.

(c) The Bureau of Federal Supply of the Treasury Department shall reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the extent of the current market price for all metals, minerals, and ores placed in the national security stock pile under this section and such credits may be expended for purchases and development and conservation payments over and above the limitations imposed in section 7 (a) hereof.

(d) Each producer shall at all times have access to a complete file of all copies of all calculations and analyses and all other information or determinations used as a basis for his individual assignment, revision, or denial of development and conservation payments or prices and exploration premiums.

(e) Copies of all rules, regulations, and policies and changes therein shall be furnished to each producer registered with the Division and shall be published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 7. (a) All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and shall not exceed $80,000,000 in any 1 year.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (a) of this section shall expire June 30, 1952.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums sufficient to carry out the provisions of this act.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this bill is an emergency national defense measure. It is necessary for the continued domestic production of such strategic materials as may be required to augment the stockpiles in case of emergency. It is patently not feasible to stockpile enough of such materials for an extended emergency, and World War II demonstrated the tremendous costs involved if we are caught short in our supply of necessary metals.

The cost of the necessary naval convoy protection alone was fantastic, as well as being uncertain and dangerous. In addition, we had the loss of many men and ships engaged in obtaining needed materials from foreign nations.

The loss of cargoes alone, in the case of chromite, manganese, tungsten, and other indispensable minerals ran as high as 75 percent. Large amounts of strategic materials were flown in by air, to escape the submarine menace, and the costs were fantastic.

Mr. President, every nation in the world is now national-defense conscious.

The recipient nations of the Marshall gift-loan plan now have the money—the dollar exchange—to purchase the necessary strategic materials for peacetime and wartime uses.

STOCKPILING ALONE NOT ENOUGH

Stockpiling alone for an emergency is not enough. No one can accurately forecast the length of any future war. Some say that the atomic bomb will make it of short duration. Other competent authorities say that certainly Russia can take the Middle East within a few weeks, whenever they are ready to do so, under present conditions. Many believe that they can take the most of Europe before we are ready.

The same authorities agree that we would win world war III, but that the time element is uncertain and that such a conflict could last from 5 to 20 years.

Mr. President, under the existing conditions of world affairs, we cannot jeopardize the welfare of the United States by depending solely upon foreign sources or upon stockpiles for the minerals and materials which we must have in our peacetime economy, or to wage a war. We must have at all times a healthy and productive domestic mining industry which can be expanded in times of need.

If a real conflict were to be waged in Europe and even if we were not a party to it—the sea lanes would be closely patrolled by submarines and airplanes to prevent any assistance from us—and we could be isolated and our industries ruined unless we were able to produce a reasonable part of our needed supplies in this country.

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a digest of the bill I have just introduced.

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

Section 1: The purpose of the bill is to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense, and to establish a Mine Incentive Payments Division within the Department of the Interior.

Section 2: The policy is:

(a) To stimulate exploration, development, mining, and production of strategic and critical metals and minerals by private enterprise.

(b) To supply United States national and industrial defense needs.

(c) To reduce dependence on foreign sources maintaining an active mining industry; by coordinating and furthering investigations to stimulate new discoveries and through stimulation of the development and utilization of domestic ores.

Section 3: (a) Creates a Mine Incentive Payments Division within the Department of the Interior.

(b) Provides for a director and an assistant director of the division.

(c) Authorizes the director to perform the necessary functions and duties to carry out the provisions of the act.

(d) Permits the director to select and employ engineers, experts, and a staff necessary to achieve the purposes of the act.

Section 4: Transfers the functions, records, and equipment of the office of premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc to the division.

Section 5: (a) Defines the ores, minerals, and metals for which development and conservation payments are to be made, and provides for the conditions under which supplies for stock piling may be purchased. In addition, a sliding scale of payments for exploration, depending on the output of the mine, is provided, the size of the payments decreasing with the increase in production. As a condition of making such payments, no royalties may be paid to landowners not actively engaged in sharing expenses of transportation, milling, and smelting.

(b) Provides for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to enter into contracts to effectuate this act.

Section 6: (a) Payments for development and conservation are to be in addition to the amounts received from other sources, and sets the maximum limits to be adjusted in accordance with changes in the wholesale commodity price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

(b) Provides for the RFC to purchase for the national security stock pile all additional ores, minerals, and metals produced as a result of incentive payments.

(c) Provides for the Bureau of Federal Supply to reimburse the RFC at current market prices for the metals, minerals, and ores purchased for the stock pile.

(d) Producers shall have access to all files of analyses used as a basis for determining denial, revision of, or assignment of payments.

(e) Provides that all rules, regulations, policies, and changes thereof shall be furnished to all producers and be published in the Federal Register.

Section 7: (a) The total amount to be expended by the RFC under this act is not to exceed $80,000,000 per annum.

(b) Effective expiration date to be June 30, 1952.

(c) Authorizes funds to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in referring to volume 1 of the National Resources Economic Committee reports entitled "The Mineral Position of the United States," and to subsequent evidence collected by the committee, it is clear that the mineral position of this country is far from healthy.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

A study completed shortly after the close of World War II indicates that 13,000 mines have been closed down in the United States since 1930. These mines involved 776,000 stockholders, and $377,000,000 of capital.

Since the end of World War II, hundreds of additional mines have shut down in various parts of the country, particularly those operated by marginal or small producers of lead, copper, zinc, manganese, and other important strategic metals and minerals.

Of 51 lead mines in operation in southern Wisconsin in 1946, only 4 are in operation today. In Colorado, the number of lead and zinc mines in operation has fallen from 313 in 1939 to 70 at the present time. More than 52 lead and zinc mines shut down within 6 months after the termination of the price-premium plan on July 1, 1947.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. In listening to the Senator's presentation of the statistics as to mines which have been closed, I am prompted to ask whether we are or are not a "have-not nation," so far as minerals are concerned?

Mr. MALONE. We are not a "have-not nation"; definitely, we are not. But the policies that have been initiated and carried out through our Government bureaus and departments have not been conducive to the development of our own mineral resources. In other words, we have slowly removed the tariffs and import duties from minerals such as copper, lead, zinc, manganese, tungsten, and other important minerals without which we cannot live either in peace or fight a war, and therefore there is no stable encouragement or no principle upon which the producers of those metals can depend, and as a result there is no incentive for the investment of money and time in the search for these metals and in making such developments.

There are plenty of mines yet to be discovered in the United States, if the incentive for their discovery exists. It must be understood that a mine cannot be developed overnight even after a good prospect is developed, after reviewing hundreds of such prospects—it requires from 2 to 5 years and the expenditure of a large amount of money to develop a real producing mine.

Mr. President, in Montana the number of lode mines producing gold, silver, copper, lead, and zinc has declined from 687 in 1940 to 250 in 1947, while the number of placer mines during the same interval declined from 285 to 44.

Similar declines in recent years in the number of mines operating could be cited for many other States. In Utah, for example, the number of mines producing gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc, and manganese declined from 191 in 1940 to 112 in 1947, while placer mines and manganese mines during the same period declined from 19 to 1.

In Arizona the number of active mines declined from approximately 950 before World War II to only 276 on October 1, 1947. In my own State of Nevada, 297 mines closed down within 2 months after President Truman vetoed the price-premium bill in July 1947. This number represents more than 90 percent of all the mines in the State.

In California, of 2,000 gold mines in operation before 1940, only 350 are in operation today, including dredges. Of 32 lead, copper, and zinc mines operating in 1946, over 80 percent have shut down. The number of mercury mines in California has dropped from 102 mines in 1940 to 20 in early 1947, and one or two in early 1948. Tungsten mines have dropped from 38 in 1944 to 12 in 1947, and practically all are closed now, while chrome and manganese show even more drastic curtailment. Manganese mines in 1944 numbered 65, as compared to 3 in 1947, while chromite mines have fallen from 101 in 1944 to 2 mines in operation in 1947.

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

Mr. MALONE. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was called off the floor a moment ago. I wish to say that the Small Business Committee is very much interested in strategic materials. Does the bill under discussion include most of the metals and minerals listed as strategic materials by the War Department?

Mr. MALONE. It includes 33 of such minerals which is practically all that are listed as strategic.

Mr. WHERRY. And is that provided for in the legislation under discussion?

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has made a rather exhaustive study, in committee, of the minerals. Is the Senator satisfied that the list is comprehensive, and that the metals about which we are so greatly worried will be included in the legislation? How does the Senator feel about that?

Mr. MALONE. I am satisfied the necessary minerals are included in the list.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to thank the Senator for his statement, because I know he has made a thorough and exhustive research in connection with these materials that are so vital to the United States. I wanted to have the statement of the Senator whether he felt satisfied in his own mind that the pending measure would take care of the situation.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I may say further that I am satisfied that such legislation is required to get the necessary domestic production to supplement the stock pile for any future emergency.

Mr. WHERRY. On that point I would ask the Senator whether he thinks private capital will get behind the pending legislation? That is another thing in which we are intensely interested. First, we are greatly interested in the preservation of the free-enterprise system that we have in America. Does the Senator feel private capital can be depended upon to assist in the exploration and development outlined in the pending measure?

Mr. MALONE. I have no doubt of it, I may say to the Senator, for the simple reason that it will establish a principle of development payments for mines of certain sizes, and as the production increases, the payments are less, and the larger mines must meet the amount. In other words, they will know what to depend on, and that is exactly what is needed as an encouragement for the expenditure of the necessary time and money in advance in order to develop producing properties.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I may suggest that unquestionably, if mining can be made profitable, there will be no question about enlisting private capital in it.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator. I heartily agree with him. There is no question about securing private capital for the highly venturesome mining business, provided there is a principle upon which returns can be based, so that those engaging in the mining business may know what they can depend upon.

Mr. HATCH. On the contrary, if mines must be continually operated at a loss, private capital is certain to lose a considerable amount of its interest.

Mr. MALONE. They have been operating at a loss, many of them, in the Senator's own State, and in my State and many others. I might mention the tri-State district in Missouri, and other places in Wisconsin. They are hanging on, but there is a limit beyond which they cannot go. In other words, the pending measure will save many operating mines, open many properties now shut down through low-wage foreign competition, and will stimulate the expenditure of time and money in searching for new properties.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, our Small

Business Committee has a section devoted to the very subject matter the Senator is so ably discussing this afternoon. It involves fundamental questions, and if the matter can be handled in the pending measure, we should be very happy. Our committee does not legislate, it simply recommends. If the bill covers the subject in the field we have studied exhaustively, I think it is meritorious, it should be given consideration by Members of the Senate.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I may say further that I think the Small Business Committee has made a very valuable contribution to this subject.

DANGEROUS SITUATION

This is a very dangerous situation from a national-defense standpoint. When the events at Pearl Harbor precipitated us into World War II we were producing about 45 percent of our domestic consumption requirements of tungsten, which was about 8.5 percent of the world production. Pearl Harbor cut us off from China and Burma, where 67 percent of the world supply of tungsten was being produced. We could have lost the war if our mines had not been in production with trained personnel and with the know-how to increase production. Molybdenum was also used as a substitute in the manufacture of certain steel items used in armament. We were able to increase the production of this indispensable metal until the sea lanes were opened up again.

I may say in regard to that important metal, tungsten, for example, we were in the business and had the trained personnel, and within 6 months, through raising the price so our domestic wages could be paid, we became practically self-sufficient in the production of tungsten in the space of a few months, which would have been impossible if the mines had been shut down and the personnel scattered. Tungsten is such a critical material that a war could be lost in the event we were unable to obtain the metal through a comparatively short period of time.

But if our mines had been shut down, we could not have met the emergency requirements. We need both a stock pile and a producing mining industry.

With war threats and actual war in many areas throughout the world, and with our own State Department and President warning the Congress and the public that war may be imminent, this Nation cannot afford to face the immediate future with such a large segment of our metal mines closed.

We need an increase in the production of these strategic materials if we are to carry out the national-defense program and have the necessary materials for a peacetime economy.

The costs involved in bringing about an increase in the production of the strategic materials should be considered as a necessary security investment in our future welfare. Of what use is an armed force unless we can provide the guns and ammunition that present-day warfare requires? In fact, such an investment will add to our national income in any case and will be recovered from increased Federal revenue.

EXCESSIVE REGULATION

Excessive regulations and red tape retard the development of reserve supplies of minerals and materials from underground sources. The way to increase reserves is to develop new ore bodies by proper exploration of mineralized zones. To obtain this exploration and development a proper price structure must be maintained and assured, free from executive order, so that private funds can be safely invested. The unit price of strategic materials should be stabilized and protected with import fees to assure the domestic mining industry that they will have a market and at a price commensurate with their cost of production.

The bill which I have introduced is designed to carry out the policy of Congress as set out in Public Law 520, namely "to provide for the acquisition and retention of stocks of these materials and to encourage the conservation and development of sources of these materials within the United States, and thereby decrease and prevent wherever possible a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of these materials in times of national emergency."

Public Law 520 was enacted in 1946. Yet, today, after 2 years, we have practically no stock pile and we have permitted the very source of these strategic materials to be cut off with the closing of hundreds of our own mines. This almost tragic situation is due primarily to two factors.

First. We have not had a policy to carry out a program of exploration and development of our domestic ore deposits.

Second. We have failed to provide a price structure which furnishes an incentive to bring about exploration and development.

PROSPECTORS, WILDCATTERS, AND DEVELOPERS

The prospectors and wildcatters have continually increased the reserves of minerals and fuels over a long period of years; however, an incentive-unit price which is not subject to change by Executive order is necessary to keep them risking their labor and money in barren drifts and dry holes in the process of developing new areas.

Successive legislation and regulation have effectively dimmed any hope of recovering past losses through future successes in the hazardous business of mining, and unless this trend can be corrected, and soon, it is believed by many authorities that our reserves will progressively decrease.

An occurrence of mineral in an outcrop or ledge is a prospect until development shows ore in paying quantities. Only one out of scores of such occurrences or prospects shows promise as a result of development.

Following a vein in solid rock is an expensive process, and thousands of dollars are expended in barren tunnels, shafts, cross cuts, and trenching for every prospect that shows promise of becoming a producer.

It requires men of courage to expend their time and money in finding the prospects, select, cut, and pan the necessary samples until a ledge is found that will attract an engineer representing enough capital to do the exploration work, should he recommend such expenditures.

Engineers do not find prospects—they examine them and make recommendations—generally unfavorable. They expect to make many examinations to find a deposit which will justify exploration work, and to make many explorations before a mine is developed.

Mining is a hazardous, expensive business; therefore, there must be an incentive reward to keep the prospectors, the engineers, and capital searching for minerals to maintain the necessary reserves. There must be an opportunity to make up past losses through future successes.

The investors must be encouraged through such legislation to back the prospectors, if we are to keep up the Nation's reserves of minerals and fuels. Our reserves of minerals depleted during the war must be rebuilt by not only stock piling critical and strategic metals and minerals but also by providing incentives which will bring about continuous production from a healthy, and productive domestic mining industry.

The system of incentive payments provided by this bill for developing domestic production of strategic minerals will result in a large increase in the number of domestic mines producing such metals and minerals as lead, copper, zinc, manganese, chromite, beryl, cobalt, graphite, kyanite, mica, nickel, tantalite, tungsten, mercury, and possibly others.

DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVE

In many instances, the adoption of a system of payments for exploration is likely to lead to the discovery of large new sources of supply, thus greatly reducing our dependence on distant foreign sources. Within the past few months, a large new source of supply of zircon has been discovered in Florida, making possible its early removal from the list of scarce, strategic metals. Exploration payments can be expected to stimulate the search for and discovery of important new deposits of many other scarce metals.

In addition to incentive and exploration payments to expand domestic production and reduce dependence on foreign countries, a program of research should be vigorously undertaken to accomplish the following two things. First, metallurgical research should be expanded in order to improve methods of extracting and preparing ores for marketing so that costs of production may be lowered. Second, an adequately financed program of research to find substitutes for scarce strategic metals and minerals should be undertaken. Already considerable progress in this field has been achieved.

SUBSTITUTES AND SYNTHETICS

The possibilities of using substitutes and synthetics to reduce our dependence on foreign sources are evident in the case of such minerals, for example, as asbestos, chromite, corundum, lead, manganese, and sapphires and rubies.

Among the German technical documents recently seized is one describing a process for making synthetic asbestos. This deserves further investigation and development. Some uses of lead can be taken over by titanium. For example, titanium can be used in place of white lead in the making of paints. The recent rapid growth in the use of aluminum in place of copper for producing cables is well known. Recently, synthetics have been developed which take the place of sapphires and rubies in many of their uses.

STOCK PILES AND CONTINUOUS PRODUCTION

Finally, domestic production from our own resources is the only safe and dependable supply in case of an emergency. A stock pile of strategic materials and a producing mining industry in time of war are worth more than all the gold in the vaults in Kentucky. For example, we must have manganese to produce steel. We need copper, lead, zinc, and all the other materials in either a peacetime economy or for national defense. We have the deposits if we will but explore and develop them. We cannot afford to neglect them any longer.

Mr. President, I wish to submit for the RECORD two tables which present a brief statistical analysis of the 33 strategic minerals eligible for benefit payments under my proposed bill.

The first table compares the 1939 market price of each metal or mineral with the current 1948 price. In the case of some of the metals, the price has risen as much as costs have in recent years. In other instances, however, current market prices are below prewar prices, as in mercury, nickel, zircon, and rutile, while in other instances current prices are only moderately above prewar and not sufficient to cover increases in labor and other costs during the past 9 years. Tungsten, tantalite, manganese, columbite, cobalt, and celestite are examples. In the case of vanadium, the present price of 27½ cents per pound is exactly the same as in 1939.

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

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of 1939 and present prices of group A strategic minerals*

Mineral	Grade	Unit	Average price, 1939	Quoted price, 1948	
				Month	Price
Antimony	99½ percent	Pound	12.36 cents	May	36.17 cents.
Asbestos	Rhodesian	Short ton	$300	February	$896 to $960.
Do	South African	do	$260	do	$350 to $545.
Bauxite	48.52 percent	Long ton	$4.50 to $5	May	$6.25 to $6.50.
Beryl	10 to 12 percent, B_2O	1 percent ton	$3 to $3.50	do	$16 to $18.
Bismuth	None	Pound	$1.05 to $1.25	do	$2.
Cadmium	do	do	64.1 cents	do	$1.75.
Celestite	92 percent strontium sulphate	Short ton	$37.49	do	$45.
Chromite, metallurgical	48 percent (3 to 1)	Long ton	$23.50 to $27	do	$38 to $39.
Cobalt	97 to 99 percent	Pound	$1.36 to $1.50	do	$1.65.
Columbite	65 percent (10 to 1)	do	49 cents	January	58 cents.
Copper	Electrolytic	do	11.07 cents	April	21.2 cents.
Corundum	None	Short ton	$53	May	$90 to $100 (estimated).
Industrial diamonds	do	Per carat	$2.73	February	$1 to $18.
Graphite	Ceylon lump	Short ton	$50 to $70	May	$215.
Do	Flake	do	$90 to $125	do	$180.
Kyanite	None	Short ton	$14	do	$45 to $65.
Lead	do	Pound	5.05 cents	April	17.2 cents.
Manganese, metallurgical	48 to 50 percent	Long ton	30 to 50 cents	May	67½ to 72½ cents.
Mercury	None	Flask	$103.94	do	$74 to $76.
Mica	Muscovite, sheet and film	Pound	30 cents to $10	do	$2 to $15.
Do	Splittings	do	22 cents	do	65 cents to $1.25.
Do	Phlogopite splittings	do	do	do	95 cents.
Monazite	None	Short ton	$75	do	$175 to $185.
Nickel	Electrolytic	Pound	35 cents	do	33¾ cents.
Platinum	None	Troy ounce	$36	do	$101.
Quartz crystal	100 to 10 M gram size	Pound		do	$2.50 to $36.
Rutile	94 percent concentrate	do	10 cents	do	8 to 10 cents.
Talc, steatite	Block or lava	Short ton	$64 to $78		Not available.
Tantalite	60 percent concentrate	Pound	$1.50 to $2.50	May	$2 to $2.50.
Tin	Grade A	do	50.2 cents	do	94 cents.
Tungsten	65 percent WO_3	Short ton unit of 20 pounds	$17.11	do	$27 to $28.
Vanadium	V_2O_5	Pound	27½ cents	do	27½ cents.
Zinc	Prime western, East St. Louis	do	5.12 cents	April	12 cents.
Zircon	55 percent ZrO_2	Short ton	$55	May	$45 to $47.

Source: Bureau of Mines, U. S. Department of the Interior, May 25, 1948.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the second table submitted shows prewar 1938 figures of production and of imports of the strategic minerals for which figures are published by the Bureau of Mines and compares these with current postwar figures of production and imports. The postwar figures are the latest made available by the Bureau of Mines.

It will be noted that in the case of several of the minerals, the imports have increased much more rapidly than domestic production, while in some instances domestic production has actually declined while imports were rapidly expanding.

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

TABLE 2.—*Prewar and postwar United States production and imports of group A strategic minerals*

Name and unit	Domestic production	Imports
Antimony (content, in short tons):		
1938	650	9,143
1946	2,505	5,905
Asbestos (in short tons):		
1938	[1] 9,471	179,490
1946	[1] 14,075	456,688
Bauxite (in long tons):		
1938	323,818	455,693
1946	1,018,774	852,005
Beryl (in short tons of ore):		
1939	95	459
1945	39	1,201
Bismuth (in pounds):		
1938	(2)	92,298
1946	(2)	(3)

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Prewar and postwar United States production and imports of group A strategic minerals*—Continued

Name and unit	Domestic production	Imports
Cadmium (in pounds):		
1938	4,184,000	22,582
1946	5,300,000	(3)
Celestite (in short tons):		
1938	(4)	276
1944	3,005	3,691
Chromite (in short tons):		
1938	909	394,335
1947	984	1,104,981
Cobalt (in pounds):		
1938	1,075	[5] 500,000 [6] 938,500 [7] 373,215
1944	828,515	[8] 3,801,441
Columbite (in pounds):		
1938	2,000	645,141
1945	1,149	4,277,152

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Prewar and postwar United States production and imports of group A strategic minerals*—Continued

Name and unit	Domestic production	Imports
Copper (in short tons):		
1938	557,763	252,164
1947	846,389	292,562
Corundum (no domestic production except some synthetic made from bauxite).		
Diamonds, industrial (all but a fraction imported).		
Graphite, natural (in short tons) (crystalline only):		
1942	7,120	10,183
1946	5,575	3,393
Kyanite, Indian (United States kyanite is not equal to the Indian product):		
1938	(3)	3,964
1946	(3)	10,782
Lead (in short tons):		
1938	369,726	112,371
1947	[9] 346,210	[10] 211,773
Manganese (in short tons of ore, containing 35 percent or more of manganese):		
1938	[11] 28,359	[12] 541,616
1947	116,671	1,378,859
Mercury (in flasks of 76 pounds):		
1938	17,991	2,362
1947	23,200	10,228
Mica (pounds of uncut sheet and punch):		
1938	939,507	391,125
1946	1,078,867	4,499,562
Monazite (in short tons) (commercial quantities are imported):		
1938	(3)	456
1945	(3)	549
Nickel (in short tons):		
1938	416	29,546
1946	352	92,500
Platinum group metals (in troy ounces):		
1938	36,213	161,189
1946	101,778	407,210
Quartz crystals (in pounds) (strategic quartz):		
1940	(3)	126,521
1945	(3)	1,329,798
Rutile (short tons):		
1939	(3)	442
1945	7,179	10,602
Sapphire and ruby	(13)	----------
Talc (black type talc)	(14)	----------
Tantalite	(15)	----------
Tin	(16)	----------
Tungsten (in short tons of ore containing 60 percent of WO_3):		
1938	4,000	171
1947	3,200	6,300
Vanadium (in pounds):		
1938	1,613,155	1,384,320
1946	1,272,148	791,057
Zinc (in short tons):		
1938	516,703	25,813
1947	[17] 624,809	[18] 369,005
Zirconium ores (no accurate statistics available, baddeleyite is not found in the United States).		

[1] Sold or used.
[2] Not published.
[3] Not available.
[4] None listed.
[5] Ore.
[6] Metal.
[7] Oxide.
[8] In oxides, metal, and ore.
[9] 1947 figure from domestic ores and base bullion at primary refineries.
[10] Ore, base bullion, etc.
[11] Shipments.
[12] For consumption.
[13] No total production figures available. Some sapphires are mined domestically; no rubies are mined in the United States.
[14] Is not found in the United States.
[15] Found with columbium together; no separate statistics available.
[16] Not domestically produced.
[17] Mine production of recoverable zinc.
[18] Zinc in ore, pigs, slabs, and blocks.

PRODUCTION AND COSTS UNSTABLE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in the case of beryl, columbite, lead, nickel, and tungsten, postwar domestic production figures show a decline from prewar levels while imports have greatly expanded. In the case of other minerals, domestic production has increased over prewar but imports have increased much more rapidly. In the case of chromite, for example, domestic production is about 8 percent above 1938, while imports have increased nearly 200 percent during the same period. A similar situation holds for mercury where domestic production increased only about 35 percent between 1938 and 1947 while imports increased by 400 percent during the same interval. Asbestos and other minerals show the same general picture.

The failure of some postwar metal prices to keep abreast of domestic increases in the cost of production, where labor costs alone have risen over 100 percent, is partly the result of reductions in tariffs under the present administration of the Trade Agreements Acts, and could be remedied by new legislation providing for a flexible import fee system to bring foreign metals prices in line with those in the United States.

Mr. President, I should like to submit a list of 33 minerals recommended for stock piling by the Army and Navy Munitions Board, for which stock piling and active domestic production are deemed the only satisfactory methods of insuring an adequate supply for a future emergency.

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

A LIST OF 33 MINERALS RECOMMENDED FOR STOCK PILING BY ARMY AND NAVY MUNITIONS BOARD

GROUP A—MATERIALS FOR WHICH STOCK PILING AND ACTIVE DOMESTIC PRODUCTION ARE DEEMED THE ONLY SATISFACTORY METHODS OF INSURING AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY FOR A FUTURE EMERGENCY

Antimony.	Mercury.
Asbestos.	Mica.
Bauxite.	Phlogopite splittings.
Beryl.	Monazite.
Bismuth.	Nickel.
Cadmium.	Platinum group metals.
Celestite.	Quartz crystals.
Chromite.	Rutile.
Cobalt.	Sapphire and ruby.
Columbite.	Talc.
Copper.	Tantalite.
Corundum.	Tin.
Diamonds, industrial.	Tungsten.
Graphite.	Vanadium.
Kyanite, Indian.	Zinc.
Lead.	Zirconium ores.
Manganese ore.	

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to submit for the RECORD at this point another list of the 33 minerals, describing the principal uses of Group "A" of the strategic minerals recommended to be stock-piled by the Army and Navy Munitions Board.

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

PRINCIPAL USES OF 33 MINERALS MAKING UP THE GROUP A OF STRATEGIC MINERALS RECOMMENDED TO BE STOCK-PILED BY THE ARMY AND NAVY MUNITIONS BOARD

ANTIMONY

Antimony has important military uses as well as industrial uses. The trichloride is used as a bronzing solution for gun barrels and as a caustic in medicine, while antimony salts are used in dyeing. One of the major wartime uses was the fireproofing of canvas used by the Army. Antimony oxide is also used extensively as an ingredient of noninflammable paint, particularly for naval and cargo ships. Standard military applications include detonating caps, shrapnel balls, and bullet cores. About 75 percent of antimony production is employed in antimonial lead. During the war a major application of antimonial lead was in the manufacture of storage batteries and bearing material.

ASBESTOS

Asbestos is of major importance in making building materials and various types of insulating products. Military construction requires large quantities of asbestos products: Aircraft, tanks, army trucks, jeeps, mobile artillery, and other military equipment have needed large tonnages of asbestos. Asbestos is also used for brake bands, clutch facings, and for insulating electric conductors. Its short fibers mixed with cement are used for building products (asbestos-cement shingles, siding, roofing, tile, and wallboard), various heat-insulation and fireproof materials, pipe covering, gaskets, packing, and chemical filters.

BAUXITE

Bauxite is of major importance in the making of aircraft and is also used in the manufacture of chemicals, abrasives, refractories, cement, as well as oil refining. It is also used as a flux in the steel and ferroalloy industries.

Of total shipments of domestic bauxite in 1940, the aluminum industry used 48 percent; aluminum abrasives and refractories manufactured in the United States and Canada used 28 percent; and the manufacture of alumina and aluminum salts by the chemical industry required 18 percent.

BERYL

Beryllium was of strategic importance in World War II due to its use in relatively small percentages for the purpose of improving physical properties of certain alloys, particularly in springs, cams, gears, precision bearings and bushings, and contact brushes. The main application is in copper-base alloys for increasing tensile strength—particularly the elastic limit, hardness, and fatigue strengths, of springs and diaphragms of delicate instruments, and especially in sensitive fire-control mechanisms for large guns. The addition of 3 percent or less of beryllium to copper makes an alloy that can be heat-treated.

BISMUTH

Bismuth and bismuth alloys are important in pattern metals and fuses in fire sprinklers. There are no effective substitutes for the major uses of bismuth.

Considerable bismuth and bismuth alloys were used during the war in the production of atomic bombs, radar equipment, and other war uses not yet made public. Bismuth is used in aluminum alloys from which the forged cylinder heads of air-cooled aviation engines are made in order to increase machinability of the forgings. The property of increased machinability of castings is also secured by additions of bismuth to malleable irons, manganese steel, and stainless steel.

Bismuth alloys are employed in the production of spotting, checking, and erection fixtures for the aviation and automotive industries; in dies for drop hammer and press forming of thin sheet metals; as fusible cores in the manufacture of electroformed hollow articles; for anchoring fragile materials during machining, grinding, and testing; as a heat-transfer medium, and for molds and patterns in precision casting.

CADMIUM

The major normal use of cadmium is the protective electroplating of steel parts for airplanes, ordnance, automobiles, ships, and electrical and communications equipment. Yellow and red pigments, bearings, solders, copper alloys and fuse metal are other applications. A recent development is the use of cadmium barriers to control atomic fission.

CELESTITE

Celestite has important military uses, particularly in tracer bullets to control the burning rate of the tracer composition. It is essential for military flares, rockets, and shells. Military flares, Very pistols, and aviation, marine, railroad, and highway signals also require celestite (strontium salts, particularly strontium nitrate).

Ground celestite is used for purifying caustic soda for the rayon industry. It is also a substitute for barite as a weighting agent in oil well drilling fluid. The petroleum industry has been the main consumer of domestic celestite.

CHROMITE

The steel industry takes the greater part of the chromite used in this country; the largest amount is consumed in making ferrochromium for use in the manufacture of stainless and other alloy steels. Some ore is used directly in the steel bath. Chromium increases hardness and shock resistance and imparts high tensile strength and ductility to steel. Other metallurgical uses include the manufacture of certain cast-iron and nonferrous alloys. The addition of chromium to cast iron reduces the grain size greatly, increases its resistance to wear and corrosion, and reduces oxidation at high temperatures. Refractory grade, as crude ore, as a plastic cement, and as brick, is used largely in steelmaking furnaces. Chemical ore is used for the production of chromium chemicals which are used in tanning leather, pigments, chromium plating, and other applications.

All stainless steels contain more than 11 percent of chromium, some of it as high as 35 percent. There is no known substitute for chrome in treating steel and other alloys. No satisfactory substitute has been found for chrome in tanning chrome leather.

COBALT

The largest use of cobalt is in stellite alloys which are used for high-speed, heavy-duty, high-temperature cutting and die materials. The second largest use of cobalt is in magnets and magnet steels. Other important applications are in high-speed steels and other cutting-tool materials, valve steel, welding rod, and carbide-type alloys. Smaller quantities of cobalt are employed in the ceramic industry, in the preparation of driers, in electroplating, as a catalyst, and for a variety of minor uses. Cobalt is an important constituent in the alloys used in jet-propulsion gas turbine and turbo-superchargers. The demand for these products may greatly increase the demand for cobalt in the future. There are no satisfactory substitutes for the metal in its principal uses.

COLUMBITE

The metallic element columbium is employed in increasing quantity to prevent intergranular corrosion of stainless steel. It is important for inhibiting the air-hardening property in 4 to 6 percent chromium steels of low carbon content. Corrosion-resistant steels containing 0.5 to 0.8 percent of columbium are used in aircraft exhaust systems, supercharger systems, and engine parts exposed to temperatures exceeding 800° F. and subject to severe corrosion or conditions likely to result in fatigue failures.

COPPER

Copper is used in hundreds of industries, but more than one-third of domestic consumption goes into electrical uses. Electrical industry uses copper in the manufacture of generators, motors, electric locomotives, switchboard, telephone, and telegraphic equipment, and light and power lines. Most of the remainder is employed by the alloy industry in manufacturing brass, bronze, and other copper alloys that are used ultimately in building construction, automobile manufacture, ammunition, shipbuilding, and a wide variety of other purposes.

In 1940, rod and wire required 120,000 tons of copper; automobiles, 103,000; buildings, 102,000; light and power lines, 74,000; and telephones and telegraphs, 49,000.

CORUNDUM

Corundum is one of the principal industrial abrasives and is a key product filling important needs in aircraft manufacture and in the production of many specialized items for mechanization of the armed forces, particularly in grinding and polishing high precision lenses for optical instruments used by the Army and Navy.

In powdered form as loose grain, this abrasive makes possible the smooth surfaces required for the accurate performance of optical lenses. For other purposes, it is used on paper and cloth in the form of abrasive wheels, cylinders, blocks, and files of varying size and shape. Grinding-wheel manufacturers use coarser grain sizes; optical-lens makers use finer size products; the fine dust that remains from the two strategic uses is purchased by retail opticians.

DIAMONDS, INDUSTRIAL

Industrial diamonds are highly useful for purposes of grinding, polishing, and drilling. Without the diamond, satisfactory precision tools, truing wheels, and wire-drawing dies cannot be produced, as no adequate substitutes have been found. Greater need for abrasive diamonds was developed in the manufacture of war materials through the development of harder metal alloys and the need for greater accuracy and higher working speeds.

Greater efficiency has resulted from the new technique of mechanically setting stones in core bits, reaming shells, and various matrices, particularly powdered metal, plastics, and ceramic bonds. Diamond dust, formerly a waste product, is added to powdered metal or bonded compositions to make abrasive wheels employed in shaping extremely hard alloys that have an essential place in industry. Diamonds are vitally needed, in addition to abrasive uses, because of abrasion-resistant qualities which make them essential as dies in drawing wires or filaments of copper, tungsten, and brass, and as atomizers in oil-burning equipment.

GRAPHITE

Graphite is used in a wide range of products. Only the coarser crystalline varieties—lump, chip, and flake graphite—are suitable for certain strategic uses. They are employed chiefly in the manufacture of crucibles and other metallurgical equipment, dry batteries, lubricants, and packings. Natural "amorphous" graphite is used extensively in carbon brushes, foundry faces, car washes, pencils and crayons, lubricants, paints, dry batteries, shoe and stove polishes, and many other commodities.

Artificial "amorphous" graphite is manufactured on a large scale in the United States, and is used chiefly in electrodes for electric furnaces. It is also used in many cases in place of the natural product.

Graphite, for use as a "moderator" in slowing down the action of neutrons of uranium, was a primary material used in research leading to the construction of the atom bomb.

Crucibles containing about 50 percent graphite were a wartime necessity in making special casings used in building naval and merchant vessels and for retorts used in recovering secondary zinc.

KYANITE, INDIAN

The capacity to withstand high temperatures makes kyanite useful as a refractory. The metallurgical industries account for about half the total kyanite refractories used in the United States. Kyanite refractories have special properties of strategic importance, particularly the ability to bear high loads at high temperatures and to resist thermal shock. These refractories are made in prefabricated and burned shapes, such as brick, tile and block. They are also employed in making plastics, cements, ramming mixes, and mortars.

Kyanite is employed in burner blocks in the superstructures of glass tanks; for plungers, rings, and tubes for feeding molten glass to forming machines; for saggers and other kiln furniture for the chinaware and pottery trade. It is also used in porcelain.

LEAD

Lead is used principally in storage batteries, pigments, cable covering, in the building trade in the form of sheets, pipes, traps, calking lead and solder, in ammunition, as foil for packaging, as tetraethyl lead for blending in gasoline manufacture, and in numerous other ways. There is no satisfactory substitute for lead in its major uses principally because the physical properties and relative cheapness of lead make it unique in its field and encouraged its substitution for other materials.

Under war conditions, lead was widely adopted as a substitute for more critical metals. It replaced tin in solders, babbitts, bearing metals, foils, and collapsible tubes; copper, zinc, and iron were replaced in certain plumbing supplies in the construction of industrial plant and equipment.

Normal uses of lead were not disturbed by the war to any extent. These uses include storage batteries, castings, bearing metals, solders, lead wool, cable covering, foil pigments, and oxides for paint, pipe metal, calking, and lead pipe. Postwar demand has remained strong, especially for storage batteries, paints, and electrical insulation. Annual consumption of more than 500,000 tons of lead is expected by the Bureau of Mines to continue for some years.

MANGANESE

About 95 percent of the manganese consumed in the United States is used in the steel industry and 5 percent in the manufacture of dry batteries and chemicals. There are no satisfactory substitutes for manganese in its important uses, such as deoxidizing, desulfurizing, and recarbonizing steels.

Manganese, when used in steel making, is employed chiefly in the form of ferromanganese, as an alloying metal, and as a purifying agent.

Manganese steel, tough and resistant to abrasion, is used extensively in the electrical industry. Compared with ordinary steel, it is a much poorer conductor of heat and electricity. Manganin, a copper-manganese-nickel alloy, is widely used in heating coils and electric furnaces, owning to its high resistance to electricity. In steel rails, manganese increases the life of ordinary carbon steel 5 to 6 times.

MERCURY

The principal wartime uses of mercury include pharmaceuticals, catalysts in connection with chemical warfare, fulminate for detonating high explosives, antifouling paint for ship bottoms, dental amalgams, electrical apparatus, barometers, gages, other instruments, and calomel for tracer bullets.

Peacetime uses of mercury are the same as wartime uses except mercury in tracer bullets. Additional peacetime uses include mercury employed for agricultural purposes, in amalgamation of gold ores, in boilers for the generation of power, in vermilion pigment, in neon lights, and in other applications.

A new dry-cell battery using mercury proved of great strategic value during World War II and promises to be of great value in the current postwar period. Certain medical uses of mercury during the war have been largely superseded by the substitution of sulfa drugs, and penicillin.

MICA

Mica is a strategic mineral in waging modern wars because of its unique value as an insulator in all forms of electrical equipment and appliances, particularly for aircraft, automobiles, and radio. Increasing application is reported as an insulator in electronics equipment; limited application of flawless sheets is made in marine compass dials, boiler gages, and iconoscopes of television transmitters. Major strategic applications were in aviation spark plugs, radio and condenser films, and bridges in radio tubes.

The principal strategic uses of sheet mica are in making radio tubes and in other communication equipment, magneto condensers, radar equipment, and airplane spark plugs. It is also used in television. About 65 percent of the strategic mica used in 1944 was employed in condensers, tubes, and other applications in radio and radar equipment.

PHLOGOPITE SPLITTINGS

Phlogopite is one of the two varieties of commercial sheet mica. (See "Mica" above.)

MONAZITE

Monazite sand is the only commercial source of thorium, cerium, and other rare earth oxides. Cerium and the cerium group were essential to many war industries. They are employed chiefly as fluorides, to stabilize the cores of arc carbons of "flaming arc" lights as stabilizers, to increase lighting intensity in searchlight cores and motion-picture projectors, as a component of flashlight powder, and for therapeutic lamps. These applications accounted for about 50 percent of consumption in 1944.

Cerium acetate has important use as a waterproof and mildewproof compound. The cerium group is also essential in the manufacture of pyrophoric (sparking) and other alloys, chiefly ferrocerium (mix metal) for sparking flints of pocket lighters and other ignition devices. This application accounted for about 25 percent of total consumption in 1944.

In prewar years, 50 percent of cerium consumption was for arc-light electrodes, 25 percent for pyrophoric alloys, and the balance for mildewproofing, ceramics, and miscellaneous uses. The other major use was in the manufacture of special optical glassware.

NICKEL

Of the total refined nickel delivered in 1945, about 60 percent was used by the steel industry in the United States. The industry used it for alloying metals. Next in volume of use were the iron and steel and nonferrous foundries, manufacturers of alloys, and the electroplating and chemical industries.

Low-nickel steels (0.5 to 0.7 percent of nickel) are essential in aircraft, automobile, and railway construction for such parts as frames, connecting rods, and axles. The use of nickel is required in many types of heavy-duty machinery and in construction shapes. High-nickel steels (7 to 35 percent of nickel) are important in shipbuilding, chemical apparatus, furnace parts, cooking utensils, and various other equipment. Precision instruments require high-nickel-steel alloys, which are also essential for controls subjected to electric current and high temperature. Nickel steels are vital in the manufacturing of armor plate, gun forgings, rotating and driving bands in shells, bullet jackets, and recoil springs.

Many peacetime applications of nickel include hardware, slide fasteners, and silver-plated flatware. Nickel electroplating has been resumed since the war, using thicker nickel coatings, particularly for automobiles and trucks.

Monel metal (nickel 67 percent; copper 28 percent; minor amounts of ferromanganese, silicon, and carbon) is widely employed in shipbuilding, for hospital and laundry equipment, and for a wide range of materials used by industry. The nickel-plating industry requires a substantial tonnage of nickel metal.

In high-speed aircraft motors, in Diesel engines, and in the moving parts of heavy-duty transportation equipment which is of vital importance in military operations nickel steel is of first importance. Worn-down parts of machinery and equipment are built up by means of nickel plating. The radio industry employs rolled nickel in the manufacture of vacuum tubes. The alloy kovar, a product of the induction furnace, contains nickel-iron-cobalt. Its unusual property of expanding with temperature at the same rate as hard glass makes possible permanent, gas-tight seals of metal to glass. This property was of major consequence in high-quantity production of radio, radar, and other military electronic tubes.

PLATINUM

During World War II platinum metal was utilized in many military and industrial applications, particularly in the construction of aircraft, ships, guns, and tanks, and in the manufacture of various types of instruments, including numerous electrical and electronic devices and radio equipment required by warfare on land, sea, and in the air. Very fine wires are used for telescope and microscope cross hairs and for electric fuses.

Platinum and platinum alloys are vital in the chemical industry and are used in the production of strategics, such as explosives and electrochemicals. One important use is as a catalyst. The chemical industry, largely as a consequence of catalytic activity, has used about 13 percent of the platinum consumed during the past 30 years.

Since 1918 the jewelry industry has taken 60 percent of the platinum used in the United States, particularly for setting gems. Platinum is also beaten into foil for use in the decorative arts. Dentistry has used about 9 percent. Platinum-base alloys are used in the finest type of dental restorations, and platinum-foil matrices for producing porcelain crowns and inlays.

Industries during World War II employed platinum and platinum alloys for producing fiber glass and rayon and in a variety of corrosion-resisting equipment.

QUARTZ CRYSTALS

Quartz crystals for many years were used principally in ornaments and in making lenses and prisms for some optical instruments. Since 1921, however, the most important use has been in the radio industry. Large quantities in recent years have been used in making special devices to control the wave frequency in electric circuits, particularly in telephonic and radio-communications systems, and in such precision instruments as range and direction finders, sound-detection devices, and seismographs.

In detection devices, ocean cables, and local and long-distance telephone transmission equipment, quartz crystal makes possible the simultaneous transmission of hundreds of independent messages over the same wire at the same time.

Current uses of quartz crystal include radios, radar, and television.

RUTILE

Rutile (TiO_2) contains 54 to 60 percent of titanium. It is the ore of titanium metal. During 1943 about 70 percent of rutile was for welding-rod coatings and over 29 percent for alloys.

Rutile and brookite have been used in the manufacture of titanium tetrachloride for making smoke clouds to cover war movements, and in ceramics. Rutile is employed in enamels and as a welding flux for use in electric welding.

A dense paint having good hiding quality results from the use of TiO_2. Strategic uses of titanium include smoke screens, bombs, pigments, ferroalloys, hard-cutting and other non-ferrous alloys. Metallic titanium is essential to the manufacture of radio tubes. Its light weight and high strength recommend it for use in aircraft construction in competition with both aluminum and magnesium.

SAPPHIRE AND RUBY

During World War II sapphires had many strategic uses by the military. Every bomber was equipped with almost 100 sapphires in various instruments. A battleship requires some 4,000 jewel bearings. Jewel bearings are required in a wide range of military instruments, particularly range-finders.

Industry employs sapphire bearings to combat wear in precision gages, Diesel injector nozzles, cutting tools, dies for drawing wire from soft metal, machining tools for soft metals, thread guides for textile mills, barometers, compasses and watches. Sapphire gauges offer closer tolerances and are of longer life than those of steel. Synthetic sapphire is used for phonograph needles.

TALC, STEATITE, BLOCK OR LAVA

The strategic steatitic lava talc is used to produce fired shapes for radio insulators, as grid spacers in high-frequency radio transmitters for ships and tanks, and for the cores, bushings, and resistors in radio, radar and other electronic equipment.

The paint industry was one of the leading markets for talc during World War II. Talc is used in paint as an inert extender. Fibrous talc used in nonreflecting paints for ship camouflage was in critically short supply in 1944.

The ceramic industry increased requirements of powdered talc in 1940 to 18 percent of total output. Ceramic talc is now a standard material for electrical and other porcelains, porcelain enamels, wall and floor tile, and refractories. Talc is also essential for certain plastics, and is employed in pharmaceuticals, soaps and cleaners, insecticides and polishes.

TANTALITE

Pure tantalite contains 70 percent of tantalum. Tantalum and tantalum alloy competes with the diamond and tungsten carbide as the hardest known substances.

Metallic tantalum is almost indispensable for large power tubes used in radios, tantalum-nickel and tantalum-tungsten being used in the manufacture of radio and electronic tubes and fountain pens. Half the 1943 consumption was for radio and electronic tubes.

Since the war tantalum, because of its high melting point, is being used to cover the external parts of jet-propulsion engines, in gas turbines and for certain furnace developments.

Other uses of tantalum include its use as a catalyst in the manufacture of synthetic rubber, and its use in making aerial camera lenses, corrosion-resistant chemical equipment, and surgical wire and skull plates.

TIN

Tin is one of the most highly strategic of metals because of its many essential uses and the fact that the United States, which consumes half the world's output, is almost wholly dependent on distant foreign sources of supply.

The major use of tin is as a protective coating for other metals, especially on steel in tin plate, from which are formed the tin cans in which processed foods and a host of other products are packed.

In the 5-year period just prior to World War II the percentage distribution of the consumption of newly mined tin in the United States was as follows: tin and terne plate 52 percent; solder, 16 percent; tubes and foil, 9 percent; babbitt, 6 percent; bronze, 5 percent; tinning, 4 percent; and other, 8 percent.

TUNGSTEN

The military importance of tungsten is indicated by the fact that during the Sec-

ond World War it was used in about 15,000 different types of war items. Tungsten is used in tungsten filament in almost every electric lamp and electric tube. In the field of hard alloys, tungsten has essential uses in armor plate, gun barrels, and the cores of small arms and large caliber armor-piercing projectiles. Tungsten alloys are employed on a large scale in making armor plate.

The chief metallurgical use is in the production of high-speed tool steels having a tungsten content of 15 to 20 percent. High-tungsten steel is used in the manufacture of valve seats for internal combustion engines, for valves, and permanent magnets, and for razor blades, knife blades, hack saws, files, drills, and many other products.

Other tungsten alloys are employed in the filaments of radio tubes, electrical-contact points, and electrodes.

VANADIUM

Vanadium is used chiefly as an alloying metal in the steel industry, where it imparts toughness, hardness, strength, and fatigue resistance to alloy steels. More than 60 percent of total vanadium consumption in 1942 was in tool steel. Chromium-vanadium steel is widely used in ordnance as well as in railway, bus, and truck parts because of its resistance to failure from fatigue.

Vanadium is mixed with other metals in alloys used for aircraft bushings, ship propellers, drills, excavating machinery, various tools, and surgical instruments. A minor quantity of vanadium is used as a catalyst in making certain organic chemicals. Other uses are in the glass, ceramic, and color industries.

ZINC

Strategic uses of zinc include the coating of steel, manufacture of brass, zinc-alloy die castings, and rolled zinc. During World War II major uses were in making brass and bronze products for galvanizing, and die casting, in zinc oxide, and in dry batteries for radios and flashlights.

The galvanizing industry in prewar years was the major consumer of zinc. The second largest consumption normally is for brass and castings, followed by uses of rolled zinc.

Zinc oxide is indispensable as a filler in compounding rubber and in the manufacture of glass. Zinc paint is one of the most durable of surface finishes. Increased use of zinc oxide is occurring as a pigment in the manufacture of paint, floor coverings, ceramics, and other materials. It is also an important pharmaceutical compound.

ZIRCONIUM

Zirconium was widely used in steel for war materials. During the war the metal was employed for fabricating wire used in the manufacture of radio tubes, for zirconium-silicon and zirconium-ferrosilicon in the steel industry, and as sheet metal for the manufacture of spinneret cups for rayon. The corrosive-resistant properties of ductile zirconium make it useful in electronic tubes, lamp filaments and welding rods in spot welding.

As an alloy, zirconium increases the strength of copper by the addition of 7 percent of the metal, and it improves the high-temperature conductivity and tensile strength of cast nickel-copper alloys. Metallic zirconium is used in the manufacture of ammunition primers, electrodes, and radio-transmitter tubes.

In the production of steel ferro-zirconium is used as an agent to remove oxygen, nitrogen, and nonmetallic impurities. Some alloys of zirconium and nickel may be substituted for tungsten in armor-piercing bullets and in cutting tools.

Zircon, which is a zirconium ore, is used in the glass and porcelain industry, and for refractories. It is also used as sand for foundry operations. Oxides, and other compounds of zirconium, are added to rubber, white leather, and resins; they are used as a substitute for zinc in weighting silk, as dye extenders, water repellents, and catalysts.

Zircon stones are used, in addition to diamonds and sapphires, as bearings for instruments.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to submit one more list of the same 33 strategic materials, group A, and the sources of supply of such minerals. This lists in the case of each mineral and material the foreign nation where it is available, and which is included in our source of supply at this time.

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

GROUP "A" LIST OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS AND THE SOURCES OF SUPPLY OF SUCH MATERIALS

Antimony: Bolivia, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Mexico, China, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Turkey, Algeria, Australia, United States, Italy.

Asbestos: Rhodesian chrysotile, South Rhodesia; South African amosite, Union of South Africa.

Bauxite: United States, British Guiana, Surinam, Hungary, France, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Greece, Italy, Yugoslavia, Netherlands Indies, Malaya.

Beryl: United States, Argentina, Brazil, Australia, India, Union of South Africa, Portugal.

Bismuth: United States, Canada, Mexico, Peru.

Cadmium: United States, Mexico, Canada, Australia, Germany, France, Belgium, Belgian Congo, Argentina.

Celestite: United States, Mexico, British Isles, Spain.

Chromite:

Metallurgical—United States, French Oceana, South Rhodesia, India, Turkey, Union of South Africa, New Caledonia, Canada, Cuba, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Refractory Rhodesian: South Rhodesia.

Other origin: Cuba, Philippines, India, Union of South Africa, Greece.

Cobalt: United States, Canada, Germany, Finland, Belgian Congo, French Morocco, North Rhodesia, Burma.

Columbite: Nigeria, Brazil, South Africa, Argentina.

Copper: United States, United States (secondary), Chile, Mexico, Canada, Rhodesia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Peru.

Corundum: Union of South Africa, South Rhodesia.

Diamonds, industrial: Belgium, Belgian Congo, British Isles, Union of South Africa, Netherlands, Gold Coast, Canada, Brazil.

Graphite:

Amorphous lump: Ceylon.

Flake: Madagascar, United States.

Kyanite, Indian: India.

Lead: United States, United States (secondary), Canada, Mexico, Peru, Australia, Germany, Belgium, Italy.

Manganese ore: United States.

Battery grade: French Morocco, Gold Coast, India, Union of South Africa.

Metallurgical grade: United States, Cuba, Mexico, Brazil, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Gold Coast, India, Union of South Africa.

Mercury: United States, Mexico, Canada, Chile, Italy, Spain, U. S. S. R.

Mica:

Muscovite block and film (good, stained, and better): United States, Canada, Argentina, Brazil, India.

Muscovite splittings: India.

Phlogopite splittings: Canada, Mexico, India.

Monazite: Brazil, British Isles, Netherland East Indies, India.

Nickel: United States, Canada, Cuba, New Caledonia, U. S. S. R., Burma.

Platinum group metals:

Iridium: United States (including secondary), Canada, United Kingdom, Norway, Columbia, U. S. S. R.

Platinum: United States (including secondary), Canada, Columbia, British Isles, U. S. S. R., Union of South Africa.

Quartz crystals: Brazil.

Rutile: United States, Brazil, Australia, French Cameroons, India, Nigeria, Norway.

Sapphire and ruby: United States, Switzerland.

Talc, steatite (block or lava): United States, India, Manchuria, Italy.

Tantalite: United States, Brazil, Belgian Congo, British East Africa, Netherlands, Australia, South Rhodesia.

Tin: British Malaya, Netherlands East Indies, Bolivia, Belgian Congo, Nigeria, China, Thailand, Portugal, United States (sec.)

Tungsten: United States, Mexico, Brazil, Bolivia, Peru, Argentina, Netherlands East Indies, China, Burma, Chosen, Portugal.

Vanadium: United States, Mexico, Peru, Argentine, Union of South Africa, North Rhodesia.

Zinc: United States, Canada, Newfoundland, Mexico, Argentina, Chile, Peru, France, Belgium, Belgian Congo, Great Britain, Germany, Poland, Australia, U. S. S. R.

Zirconium ores:

Baddeleyite: Brazil.

Zircon: United States, Brazil, Australia, India.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I suggest that it will be realized immediately, from an inspection of the list of foreign sources of these indispensable minerals, that the expense and danger in keeping the necessary sea lanes open in time of emergency is almost prohibitive.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. From my service with him on the Committee on Public Works I know the great amount of time he has been giving to the subject he has been discussing. I know also that there is probably no one else in the Senate who has the engineering background to make this study. It is my opinion that it has been done practically single handed by the able and distinguished Senator from Nevada. I am not very well qualified, because of my lack of technical knowledge, to question the Senator, but I should like to ask him upon what ground he believes that this program of payments he has spoken of so ably would stimulate and bring about the production of the important and essential strategic materials he has mentioned.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. My reason for believing that it will stimulate production is that the lack of production has been occasioned by lack of stability of unit prices. In other words, with labor costing $8 or $10 a day in the mining industry, we are competing directly, without tariff or import fees, with 40- or 50-cent a day labor in China on tungsten, and $1.50 to $2 labor in Spain on mercury, with similar comparative costs of other metals in the low-wage competitive countries. In other words, it is impossible for our producers to compete with the lower wage-living costs in competitive foreign nations. Practically all of these minerals are produced in one or more of the lower living standard foreign nations, and of course the labor and costs of

mining being lower, it is impossible for producers here to compete.

The proposed legislation makes up the difference to a reasonable degree, so that a private investor or prospector who is spending his time and money looking for mines, or engineers and developers, can be reasonably assured that if they do find a mine they can sell the minerals for enough to pay the labor, including the costs of mining, and secure a reasonable return.

Mr. COOPER. I hope the Government and the Senate will give to the bill the consideration which the Senator's long work and study of this problem deserve.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports were submitted:

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

Executive A, Eightieth Congress, first session, and Executive G, Eightieth Congress, second session. A convention between the United States of America and France, signed at Paris on October 18, 1946, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of evasion in the case of taxes on estates and inheritances, and for the purpose of modifying and supplementing certain provisions of the convention between the two governments relating to income taxation signed at Paris on July 25, 1939; without reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 7).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive E, Eightieth Congress, second session. A treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Italian Republic, together with a protocol and an additional protocol relating thereto, signed at Rome on February 2, 1948; without reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 6); and

Executive J, Eightieth Congress, second session. A treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Republic of China, together with a protocol thereto, signed at Nanking on November 4, 1946; with a reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 8).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the Executive Calendar is in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the treaty on the calendar be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the treaty will be passed over.

The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul R. Rowen to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 27, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 26 (legislative day of May 20), 1948:

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Fred S. Martin, of New York, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of William T. Sherwood, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for advancement on the retired list and to be placed on the retired list under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

TO BE GENERAL

Maj. Gen. Brehon Burke Somervell, O3665, United States Army, retired.

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL

Maj. Gen. Levin Hicks Campbell, Jr., O3194, United States Army, retired.

Maj. Gen. John Lesesne DeWitt, O742, United States Army, retired.

Col. Troy Houston Middleton, O3476, United States Army, retired.

Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, O2448, United States Army, retired.

Maj. Gen. Wilhelm Delp Styer, O4415, United States Army, retired.

Brig. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves, O12043, United States Army, retired.

Lt. Gen. Raymond Albert Wheeler, O3064, Army of the United States, Chief of Engineers (major general, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Gen. Lucius DuBignon Clay, O9318, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be Commander in Chief and Military Governor, United States Zone, Germany, with the rank of general.

Lt. Gen. Clarence Ralph Huebner, O4552, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be Deputy Commander in Chief, United States Zone, Germany, and Commanding General, United States Army, Europe, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Lt. Gen. Willis Dale Crittenberger, O3548, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be Senior United States Army member of the military staff committee of the United Nations with the rank of lieutenant general, vice Lt. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, with dates of rank to be as established under the provisions of the aforementioned title:

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Maj. Gen. Ray Edison Porter, O7168, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Wilson O'Daniel, O7342, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. David Lewis Ruffner, O6997, United States Army.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 26 (legislative day of May 20), 1948:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Paul R. Rowen to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1950.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Col. Charles Parsons Nicholas to be professor of mathematics at the United States Military Academy, with rank from date of appointment.

Appointments in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.):

To be lieutenant colonel

John S. Oartel

To be majors

Robert F. Corwin
Frederick M. Jacobs
Samuel J. Newson
Carl J. Welge

To be captains

Herbert M. Alston
Michael J. Eyen
Peter M. Margetis
Evan W. Molyneaux
John C. Patterson
Alfred G. Siege
Justin S. Zack

To be first lieutenants

John C. Adam
Glenn R. Carwell
Alvin Cohen
Lyle H. Edelblute
Oliver C. Hood
James H. Johnson
Frederick F. Krauskopf
Sidney L. Marvin
Revere A. Nielsen
Horace H. Osborne
Richard M. Paddison
Alexander C. Peat
Irvin C. Plough
Raymond E. Ponath
Stanley D. Rapinchuk
Irwin E. Rosen
Wilson R. Scott
Henry A. Segal
Donald J. Strand
Julius W. Taylor
Robert S. Tolmach
Lewis F. Townsend, Jr.
Harvey H. Waldo
Donald M. Wright

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, who are scheduled for graduation on June 8, 1948, for appointment as second lieutenants in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 506, Officer Personnel Act of 1947, date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army:

To be second lieutenants, Regular Army

Howard Edward Adams
Harry Thomas Adkins, Jr.
Albert Feleciano Alfonso
Reuben Livingston Anderson, Jr.
Louis Leland Anthis
David Wesley Armstrong
Joel David Aron
Neil Rice Ayer
William Reid Bandeen
James William Barnett, Jr.
Hayden Julian Bayer
Walter Beinke
Daniel Randall Beirne
John Bellinger Bellinger, Jr.
Sidney Bryan Berry, Jr.
Edward Hiltner Bertram, Jr.
Eugene Stanton Bierer
James Arthur Blakeslee
Raymond Urban Bloom
Charles Arthur Borg, Jr.
Keith Alden Boss
Thomas Willard Bowen
Walker Syer Bradshaw
Joseph Key Bratton
John William Brennan
Harry Augustine Buckley, Jr.
William Claiborne Buckner
William Curoe Burns
William Edmund Byers
William Burns Caldwell
Edward Francis Callanan
Francis Paul Cancelliere
Jack Lee Capps
Leslie Dillon Carter, Jr.
Donald Albert Cerow
Lewis Chandler
John Howell Chitty, Jr.
Lake George Churchill, Jr.
Joseph Phillip Cimo
Thomas Ryan Clark
Carter Weldon Clarke, Jr.
Sam Grady Cockerham
Roger Frankland Conover
William Loch Cook II
Richmond James Cooper
Thomas Bledsoe Cormack
Charles Lanham Crouch
Robert Hamilton Cushing
Philip Stevens Day, Jr.
Donald Edward Deehan
James Webster Dingeman
John Joseph Doody
Joseph Pembroke Dorsey
Mercer McConnico Doty
Lee Thomas Doyle
Raymond Cameron Drury, Jr.
John Spier Egbert
Duane Lee Emerson
Wallace Owens Enderle
Robert Richard Finnegan
Eugene Calvin Fleming, Jr.
Ashby Minor Foote, Jr.
Eugene Priest Forrester
Charles Nelson French, Jr.
James Clyde Fry, Jr.
Pierce Horatio Gaver, Jr.
Lowell Burke Genebach, Jr.
Robert Elwood Graf
Stephen Murray Griffith
James Burnus Hall
Robert Francis Hallahan
John Duncan Hamilton
Richard Stanley Harsh
George William Hartnell
Louis William Haskell, Jr.
Jay Allan Hatch
Thomas William Hazard, Jr.
Jess Byrd Hendricks, Jr.
Joseph Shindler Herbets
Hugh French Thomason Hoffman, Jr.
Sam Cromwell Holliday
James Frank Hooker, Jr.
Charles Samuel Horn
Lawrence Vinton Hoyt
Wallace Henley Hubbard
John Bell Hughes, Jr.
Douglas Theodore Huie
Rufus Johnston Hyman
Benedict Ralph Jacobellis
James Lloyd Jones
J. Wesley Jones, Jr.
Louis Raymond Jones
Rees Jones
Thomas Tytherleigh Jones
William Mason Kaula
John Patrick Kean
Jesse Tompkins Kelsey
Joseph Mortimer Kiernan, Jr.
Robert Lee Kirwan
Edward Thomas Klett, Jr.
Oscar Frederick Kochtitzky, Jr.
Harvey Robinson Livesay, Jr.
Norman Bertram Lovejoy
James Edgar Macklin, Jr.
David Saltonstall Mallett
John Calvin Maple
Walter Frank Marciniec
Robert Wiley Marshall
Frank Lee McClaflin
Don Stuart McClelland
James Gordon McCray
John Joachim McCuen
John Winn McEnery
Charles Frederick McGee
Donald Charles McGraw
Houston Moore McMurray
David William McNeely
Garland Ray McSpadden
Gerald William Medsger
Walter Edwin Meinzen
Joseph Henry Meyer
Jack Rowland Miller
John McKenna Milton
Edwin Blakely Nelson
John Martin Nelson
Kenneth William Olson
John Luke Osteen, Jr.
Alfred Arthur Pabst
Donald Flint Packard
William Ashbrook Patch
Edwin Dennis Patterson
Ralph Winston Pearson
Harrison Perry
Hugh Wiston Perry
Robert James Petersen
Walter William Plummer, Jr.
Kenneth Irving Pressman
Saul Martin Resnick
James Warren Richardson, Jr.
Claron Atherton Robertson, Jr.
Lem Frank Robinson, Jr.
Norman Leander Robinson, Jr.
Tenney Kutz Ross
Edwin A. Rudd
James Cornelius Ruddell, Jr.
Kenneth Edward Ruddy
William Thomas Ryan
Arnold Melville Sargeant, Jr.
William Francis Schless
Walter Burns Schlotterbeck
Carl Walter Schmidt
Willard Warren Scott, Jr.
Merle Gardner Sheffield
Charles Harwood Shook
William Alvin Shuster II
Harwell Fitzhugh Smith, Jr.
Donn Albert Starry
Harry John Sternburg
Charles Henry Sunder
George Alvis Swearengen
Edward Parry Sykes, Jr.
J. Robert Taylor
William Gwyn Thomas, Jr.
Frederick Edwin Tibbetts III
William Harrison Travis
James Gates Tuthill
Thomas Burdick Tyree
Elmer Cornelius Vreeland, Jr.
John Baker Wadsworth, Jr.
John Garnett Waggener
Fred Emerson Wagoner, Jr.
James Frederick Walk
Lyle Edward Walter
Robert Marion Ward
Thomas Allen Ware, Jr.
Richard Lauren Warren
John Elliott Watkins
Kenneth Eugene Webber, Jr.
Richard Glenn Weber
Edward Ansel White
Ennis Clement Whitehead, Jr.
Robert Allison Whitfield
Arthur Langley Whitley
Philip McIlvaine Whitney, Jr.
William Wallace Whitson
Glenn Castle Wilhide, Jr.
Walworth Forman Williams
Andrew Benedict Witko

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, who are scheduled for graduation on June 8, 1948, for appointment as second lieutenants in the Regular Air Force of the United States, under the provisions of section 506, Officer Personnel Act of 1947, date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be second lieutenants, Regular Air Force of the United States

Andrew Broadus Anderson, Jr.
Carl Andrew Anderson
Russell Conwell Ball, Jr.
Kenneth Hawthorne Barber
Arthur deRohan Barondes
Carey Bishop Barrineau
Raymond Oscar Barton, Jr.
Richard Parks Berry
Waldo Emmerson Bertoni
Harry Moody Bettis, Jr.
Arnold Webb Braswell
Jay Richard Brill
John Joseph Buckley, Jr.
Theodore Bruce Buechler
William Claude Burrows
Blaine Raymond Butler, Jr.
Fred Isaac Chanatry
Charles Eads Coons
John Francis Creed
William J. Crosby
Richard Dickson Cudahy
Robert Carroll Davis
Daniel De Foe
Walter Albert della Chiesa
John Francis Dent, Jr.
Sims Gerald Dildy
Benjamin Joseph Di Loreto
William Pinkerton Dougherty
Benjamin Wynn Eakins
George Martin Edwards, Jr.
John Arnold Edwards
Clarence Couch Elebash
David Draper Garrison
Patteson Gilliam
Harold Sherwood Gillogly
Joseph Eugene Gorrell
Warren Reed Graves
William Comstock Hayden
Wilho Richard Heikkinen
Joseph William Huey
Samuel Fuqua Hurt
Floyd Allan Johnston
Jay Silverman Josephs
John Kastris, Jr.
Donal Denis Kavanagh
Alfred Henry Kerth, Jr.

Donald Charles Kipfer
Edward Anderton Kritzer
George Adelbert La Pointe
George Newton Leitner
Vincent Paul Lewando
Louis LoConte, Jr.
W. Grim Locke
Denman Murray Long
William Henry Lynch
William Meredith Lyon
Gaylord MacCartney
William James Madden
Nasor John Mansour, Jr.
Robert Couth Mathis
William Thornton McGinness
Francis William McInerney, Jr.
James Clifford McManaway, Jr.
Richard Lee Miner
Otis Corcoran Moore
Rhonel Earl Morgan
William Donald Mounger
James Allen Muehlenweg
Morton Claire Mumma III
William Charles Ocker
William Thomas O'Connell, Jr.
Robert Edwin Pater
Jack Francis Peppers
Thomas Albert Phillips, Jr.
John Charles Pickering
Robert Murray Pomeroy
Jacob Barnard Pompan
Philip Steven Porter
Alton Harold Quanbeck
Donald Hood Reynolds
Evan William Rosencrans
George Warren Rutter
James Gage Sandman
Rodman Saville
Louis Wellington Schalk
Irving Bernard Schoenberg
Edward Leigh Scott
Richard James Seguin
Ivan Morange Selig
James Cole Shively, Jr.
Richard Ingram Skinner
Charles Peter Skouras, Jr.
William Young Smith
Arthur Snyder, Jr.
Richard Neil Stein
Henry Barthold Stelling, Jr.
Donald Brunhoff Swenholt
Michael Joseph Tashjian
Stanley Edward Thevenet
George Selby Thomas
Robert Armes Van Arsdall
James Alward Van Fleet, Jr.
Walton Vernon Waller
Paul Elwood Weaver
Samuel White, Jr.
Francis Marion Williams
Odell Wynne Williamson, Jr.
John Kesson Withers
Charles Anderson Wurster
Stewart Young

To be Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with the rank of general

Maj. Gen. Muir Stephen Fairchild AO10555, United States Air Force.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Lewis H. Cameron
Elisha G. Cloud
William G. Crocker
Loren T. Erickson
Mack R. McClure
Sherman L. Prosser
John E. Rudder
Nicholas M. Trapnell, Jr.
William F. Trisler
James R. Young
Simon I. Degulis
Joseph P. B. Franklin
James R. Gallman, Jr.
Philip J. Garm
Jack E. Harlan
James E. Harrell
Francis R. Hittinger, Jr.
Floyd G. Hudson
Arthur R. Mansfield, Jr.
Edwin A. Pollock, Jr.
Jack L. Selk

To be second lieutenants from June 4, 1948

Hugh D. Adair, Jr.
Richard T. F. Ambrogi
George T. Balzer
Robert R. Carson
Leamon R. Cooke
Robert R. Dickey III
Lucius V. diLorenzo
Edward F. Duncan
Richard N. Hall 2d
Henry C. Hamilton, Jr.
Dean B. Hansen
Lee R. Howard
Charles J. Kelly
Floyd M. McCurdy, Jr.
Ben A. Moore, Jr.
Richard C. Morrow
Merrill L. Norton
Keith O'Keefe
Orlo C. Paciulli, Jr.
John M. Perkins
Robert D. Reem
Jack W. Robbins
Edwin M. Rudzis
Roy K. Russell
Richard D. Schneider
Robert N. Smith
James W. Strother
Robert G. Tobin, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

To be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy

Roger C. Bliss
Leonard E. Brock
Robert T. Broili
Ramon L. Burke
LeRoy T. Carter
Homer Fults
Andrew Khourie
William J. McMordie
James R. Martin
Roy D. Monnie
Dean O. Powell
Ben R. Schmidt
Robert G. Whitman
Fred I. Woodworth, Jr.

To be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy

Joseph G. Power.

To be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy

Herbert L. Baker
Philip S. Birnbaum, Jr.
Charles Blutzo
John L. Dixon
Albert H. Gallaher
Howard D. Graessle II
Wayne C. Hall, Jr.
Jerry D. Harshman
Theodore R. Howell
Jack H. McDonald

To be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy

Frances J. Bombriant
Ruth L. Brenner
Eleanor M. Budinsky
Frances S. Czegely
Helen Daroska
Barbara Ellis
Norma J. Geho
Ruth L. Grass
Julie E. Kell
Helen A. Kenyon
Elsie M. Lovely
Elizabeth M. McLaughlin
Virginia R. Mussen
Cecile R. Normandin
Mary E. H. O'Brien
Kathleen J. O'Kane
Jean B. Pieczarka
Marie L. Rios
Dorothy L. Rowe
Margaret Russell
Sara A. Sims
Edith A. Smith
Mary R. Thames
Evelyn M. Vejvoda
Gloria J. Vesper

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

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

In Thy holy name, O blessed Saviour, we would offer our prayer at our Father's throne. We beseech Thee to teach us how to pray. Do Thou open our eyes to see the right; reveal unto us Thy will and purpose; clothe us with the virtue of the will to wait and with the patience of unanswered prayer.

Today we are mindful of the countless boys and girls who, with bounding hopes, are leaving our schools. As upon them rests the foundations of the future on which we are to live or die, we earnestly pray for them. Inspire them to love our historic past, with its toil and sacrifice, and to consecrate themselves at the altar of our country, that their liberty and personal rights may be secure and they be an inspiration and blessing to all the world. In Jesus' name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5883. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. REED, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1676) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes," and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GURNEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. DOUGHTON asked and were given permission to revise and extend the remarks they expect to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include excerpts, quotations, and extraneous material.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

TAX SLAVES FOR ERP

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there will be no rest for the weary American taxpayer. Since the fighting came to an end 3 years ago he has been asked to underwrite the world. First came UNRRA, next Bretton Woods, then the British loan, and more later. The foreign relief bills have been coming so fast it is hard to keep up with them. We get so we do not remember those that cost only a few hundred million dollars. We think only of those which run into the billions. In almost every case we have been told that the proposal being

considered at the moment was the final one; if passed and passed quickly, it would produce world recovery.

A great deal of this session has been taken up with the nebulous theory behind the so-called European recovery plan. It was sold on a basis that it would help stop the spread of communism, yet we find that its basic premise rests on increased trade across or under the iron curtain. We are now told that without this trade western Europe will collapse. The sponsors of this plan now contemplate that this 4½-year European recovery program is only the beginning and after it comes the rest of the world. For my authority I quote Monsieur Marjolin, secretary general of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, successor to the Bevin committee. On May 13, M. Marjolin told the American Club in Paris that the immediate aim, of course, was to restore Europe so that she could dispense with outside help, but that the development of Africa, South America, and Asia would demand the combined efforts of the United States with a rehabilitated Europe. That was a long-range aim.

And so, my colleagues, if you think there is going to be any rest for our poor taxpayers in 4 or 5 years, you are mistaken. Mr. Speaker, if we are to support foreign economies in the style to which they would like to become accustomed, we had better get ready to foot the bill for increased taxes.

VETERANS' HOUSING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind the House, and the leadership especially, that the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs passed a very fine amendment to the GI bill of rights, the so-called American Legion Homestead Act. It is the only bill which is entirely for veterans and, so far as I can find out, it is the only bill that will provide houses for veterans. It passed the Committee on Veterans' Affairs unanimously. I understand that in about 4 weeks the Congress will adjourn. This bill providing houses for veterans should pass if any bill passes. It should pass immediately. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has asked for a rule, and, as chairman of that committee, I have asked the leadership of the House to bring the bill up for action in any way possible. The bill is self-liquidating and will provide low-cost housing and rentals for veterans. The loans will be made at a low interest rate. What will many Members say to the veterans if this bill be not passed?

THE TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

Mr. RANKIN. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the Congress authorized the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, which will give a slackwater route, or what amounts to a slackwater route, from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, as well as to Pittsburgh, Pa., on the Ohio, Minneapolis and St. Paul on the Mississippi, and still leave the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic. It will also shorten the distance between our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and the Gulf by about 800 miles, and contribute greatly to our national defense.

It will save untold millions of dollars to the shippers along the Missouri, the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Illinois, the Great Lakes, the Tennessee, and the Tombigbee—to say nothing of what it will mean as a means of ingress and egress to our Oak Ridge plant, the greatest defense project on earth.

The Senate has approved an appropriation of $1,500,000 to begin this work. The Army engineers are ready, they have their machinery ready, they are not only ready but they are anxious to begin this work.

I am making this appeal now to the conferees on that bill to go ahead and approve that appropriation. If we can pour billions of dollars into Europe, Asia, and Africa to improve the streams of foreign countries and rebuild their hydroelectric power plants, surely we can appropriate this small amount to begin development of our own inland waterways transportation system, and to aid the defense of our country.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. WHEELER. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to announce the filing of petition No. 19 at the Clerk's desk for the discharge of the Committee on Education and Labor from consideration of the bill (S. 472) to provide Federal aid for education. Less than 4 weeks remain of the present session of Congress with increasing probability that the Federal aid to education bill will not be passed. That would be a national tragedy. I would like to ask that all of those who are interested in this particular measure sign the petition as quickly as possible. Time is short.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. CELLER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Sun.

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

SEIZURE OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I read with amazement of the seizure by the Government of Lebanon of 41 American citizens after forcibly, at bayonet point, taking them from the steamship *Marine Corps*. This is followed up by the audacity of Syria and Egypt declaring a blockade and the mining of its waters, making it highly dangerous for American ships to proceed therein. We went to war for interference of our ships in 1917. These irritating and aggressive acts of the Arabs are, in common parlance, "socks in the jaw" that America should not take lying down.

I believe that we should divert some of our destroyers and mine sweepers now in the Mediterranean, let them proceed to the ports of Alexandria, Tyre, and Beirut, and show the Arabs our naval guns and let them hear their salvos.

In 1904, when I was a lad, Raisuli, a Riff bandit, seized an American citizen in Morocco. Perdicaris was his name. Secretary Hay, under the instruction of Theodore Roosevelt, President, sent a very strong protest to the Sultan of Morocco, demanding the immediate release of that American citizen, Perdicaris. I recall the famous phrase that Hay used: "It shall be Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead." In addition to the warning we sent warships to the coast of Morocco and landed marines to guard our consulate. Our American citizen was released. We maintained our prestige and honor then. Can we do any less now? Then one citizen was in danger. Now there are 41 citizens. The action of Syria and Egypt is contemptuous of us. Assuredly, some show of force is essential. Are those in control of policy at the State Department men or mice? They should have no inhibitions to protect our honor.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

AID TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. KLEIN. 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. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that about a week ago I took the floor and suggested that Great Britain be cut off from aid under the European recovery plan because of the fact that England is encouraging the Arab states and supplying money to them for the continuation of the Arab war against the new state of Israel.

It will be noted from the newspapers that in another body the Appropriations Committee has inquired into whether money advanced under the Marshall plan is being used to purchase arms for the Arabs. The point should be, and I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will give some thought to this phase, that if Great Britain can afford to use $8,000,000 to give to the Arab states and to supply them with arms,

then the question should certainly come up as to whether she needs any aid under the European recovery plan. It is outrageous that the money we are giving them is being dissipated in such manner, and I hope that the gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee will look into it very carefully.

Certain British officials have pointed out that thus far there have been no benefits to Great Britain from the Economic Cooperation Administration. This is quibbling. The allocations are now being worked out, and in any case Great Britain has benefited hugely from the British loans, from lend-lease operations, and from the Greek and Turkish aid programs.

As a matter of fact, there is a whole broad field opened up here for the scrutiny of the Committee on Appropriations.

Has military aid furnished to Turkey been used in aggressive warfare against Israel, directly or through secret connivance among the Arab states? Has lend-lease material given to Great Britain and Egypt been used to attack the new democracy in Palestine?

Without the American subsidies, could Great Britain have afforded the lavish bribes of money, matériel, and manpower given to the members of the Arab League?

In short, Mr. Speaker, the committee could justifiably ask, Have not American loans and gifts propped up a dying empire without any benefit to civilization? And why should we continue those subsidies against our own national interests?

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] in reference to the Federal-aid-to-education bill. I hope the House will act on that bill before the close of the present session of Congress.

If I understand correctly, $500,000,000 was voted to Portugal under the so-called Marshall plan, better known to myself and others as the Bevin plan. Five hundred million dollars to Portugal, a nation that never fought in either World War I or World War II, yet we cannot get $300,000,000 to help educate the boys and girls of this country.

The answer to the problems of this Nation today and to the problems of the world is a moral, spiritual, and educational uplifting of its standards. This can only be accomplished by more attention to our youth through education.

I say, gentlemen of the House, I hope that in this session of the Congress we will do something about this Federal aid-to-education bill. Certainly it is needed, and if we are to prevent any kind of ism, we need to educate our own people.

The best way to have better education is to raise the standard of living of those entrusted with the training of our young people. Every teacher in every State of this Union should have a minimum salary of at least $2,400 a year. This type of investment in our youth will pay more dividends in the future than any other activity of our Government. It is with pleasure that I sign among the very first this discharge petition No. 19 to force the Federal aid-to-education bill on the floor of this House before we recess for the summer.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

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

GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA

Mr. RAMEY. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the statement made by our chairman, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and also those made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] in regard to veterans' legislation. However, I ask for this 1 minute in order to address my remarks to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], by reason of his statement in regard to spending. It has been charged on the floor of this House that there are two or three unusually large lobbies, but I will say to the gentleman from New York it seems to me that the greatest and most dangerous "ism" that we have in this country is governmentism itself that asks us to spend. The greatest pressure that we have is from the groups in government, the agencies themselves, telling thousands of people in your district to write you to pass this and that—to spend—to surrender individual liberty to Government control, thus again to spend more money, and more money, and more money. It has been charged here that there is a real-estate lobby. I doubt whether anyone has heard from a realtor. However, how many letters have been sent from Government agencies asking the people to write—and write—for you to spend and spend.

Home builders have been smeared by Government "isms" who in reality if their ways were realized would soon have our Government in reality communism in action.

Some speculative builders and investors do not care to meet the urgent need for decent shelter for low-income families, therefore, Government may have to fill this gap by the T-E-W legislation. But it must not be another Wilson Wyatt experience. That blundering was the Communist manifesto in action on a small scale. The tragedy was it fooled even some intelligent groups by its propaganda.

There is a difference between speculative builders and home builders. The former are the wrecking crew—the latter the construction gang.

INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2878) to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WELCH, CRAWFORD, D'EWART, MURDOCK, and PETERSON.

LOWER YELLOWSTONE IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3731) authorizing modifications in the repayment contracts with the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1 and the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2, 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 5, line 10, strike out "modification" and insert "modifications."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING STATE OF MINNESOTA TO CONDEMN LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3785) to authorize the State of Minnesota to condemn lands owned by the United States in the county of Cass, State of Minnesota, for fish propagation, 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 2, line 24, strike out "47" and insert "27."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted the following conference report and statement

on the bill (S. 2277) to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2277) to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, and 5.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1 and 2, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: *"Provided,* That no property shall be determined under this paragraph to be suitable or desirable for use as an historic monument except in conformity with the recommendation of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments established by section 3 of the Act entitled 'An Act for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes', approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), and no property shall be so determined to be suitable or desirable for such use if (A) its area exceeds that necessary for the preservation and proper observation of the historic monument situated thereon, or (B) it was acquired by the United States at any time subsequent to January 1, 1900", and amend the Senate engrossed bill as follows:

On page 3, line 16, strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof ", and."

On page 3, line 17, strike out the semicolon and all thereafter to and including "(61 Stat. 202)" in line 21, page 3.

On page 4 strike out all in lines 7-21, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 3. Section 18 (e) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby repealed."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
MELVIN C. SNYDER,
CARTER MANASCO,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
HARRY F. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2277) to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: These are clerical amendments. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 3: The Senate bill contained no limitation upon the area of any tract of land which could be conveyed to a State, political subdivision, or municipality for use as a public park, public recreational area, or historic monument. The House amendment would limit any tract conveyed for any such purpose to an area not in excess of 500 acres. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: The Senate bill permitted the conveyance of land to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities only for use "as a public park, public recreational area, or historic monument, for the benefit of the public." The House amendment would permit such conveyances to be made also for use in connection with any of the other governmental functions of any State, political subdivision, or municipality. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 6: The Senate bill contained no limitation upon the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to determine that property is suitable and desirable for historic monument use. The House amendment added a proviso which would, in general terms, require the Secretary, in determining that any tract of land is suitable or desirable for use for historic-monument purposes, to give due consideration to the period of time during which the United States has enjoyed continuous ownership thereof. The conference agreement retains the substance of this proviso, but amends its language in such manner as to (1) provide that no property shall be determined by the Secretary to be suitable and desirable for historic monument use unless such determination is supported by an affirmative recommendation made by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, and (2) prohibit the conveyance of any land for historic monument use if the area thereof exceeds that necessary for the preservation and proper observation of the historic monument situated thereon, or if such land was acquired by the United States at any time after January 1, 1900.

As passed by both Houses, S. 2277 contained provisions which would amend existing law conferring upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the right to purchase surplus real property for resale to small business, and defining the priority granted to the Corporation for that purpose. The conferees found that such provisions of S. 2277, if enacted into law, would be in conflict with section 7 of S. 2287, entitled "An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes," which was passed by the House on May 12 and by the Senate on May 13, and which has been forwarded to the President for his signature. That section of S. 2287 repeals section 208 of title II of a joint resolution approved June 30, 1947 (Public Law 132, 80th Cong.), which established the right of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase surplus property for resale to small business and prescribed its priority. In consequence, the enactment of S. 2277 in the form in which it was passed by both Houses would, in part, amount to the amendment of a provision of law which will not be in existence after the approval of S. 2287 by the President. Accordingly, the conference agreement amends S. 2277 to conform to the provisions of S. 2287 by (1) striking out the text of section 3 of S. 2277, (2) deleting from the amendment to be made by section 2 of S. 2277 the reference contained therein to the priority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the purchase of surplus property for resale to small business, and (3) adding as the new text of section 3 of S. 2277 a provision repealing section 18 (e) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, under which the power to purchase surplus property for resale to small business was first conferred upon the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and later provided in part the authority for the exercise of such right by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The House amended the title of the bill to conform to the broader purpose expressed in House amendments Nos. 4 and 5. The House recedes.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
MELVIN C. SNYDER,
CARTER MANASCO,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill S. 2277.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the conference report that you have just heard read is farther reaching in its implications than you realize unless you have studied this entire situation. This is the first time an attempt has been made to give blanket authority for the transfer of Government-owned lands to the States or the political subdivisions thereof. A casual glance at the calendar will show that matters of this sort are always disposed of according to each individual project.

Under this legislation the armed forces have declared as surplus land acquired during the war. This property is now in the custody of the Surplus Property Administration. If this conference report is adopted, it will be possible for the Governors of every State to go to the Surplus Property Administration with a request for any amount of land that they desire, at the same time criticizing the Government for wasting money. It certainly seems to me we ought not to depart from the well-established practice of considering each individual project on its own merits. At the time the bill came here from the other body and was on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, certainly a measure of sufficient importance to justify its being considered under a rule, it was represented that there were four or five historical sites in the United States that should be transferred to States or to cities in order to preserve their historical value. But this bill goes infinitely farther than that. I cannot understand why our objectors as diligent and as careful as they have always been in matters of great importance, permitted this bill to pass on the Consent Calendar. After unanimous consent had been given for its consideration, I offered an amendment which would have limited the amount of land that could be given to a State or political subdivision thereof to 500 acres. It seems to me that that should be the very limit of our largesse. I trust that this conference report is voted down so that every project that is worth while and has merit can be considered in an individual bill so that we will have an opportunity to know just exactly how far-reaching this legislation is.

I ask the House to vote the conference report down. By so doing, we are not going to eliminate the possibility that

these historical sites will be transferred to the States. Of course not. We have done that right along throughout the entire history of the Congress. But that is the old-established practice, and it seems to me that it ought not to be departed from at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as may seem to be sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, just a word about the history of this legislation. The Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives reported and the House passed four or five special bills authorizing the War Assets Administration to turn over to States or municipalities certain specified areas. The bill went to the other body, and the Committee on Armed Services of the other body came to the conclusion that instead of doing this work piecemeal, with each turn-over of property being dependent upon a separate bill, it would be better to establish a general policy. So the other body passed the bill, S. 2277. First let me say that these properties with certain exceptions are not to be turned over as gifts. The bill provides as passed by the other body that the States or municipalities shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property. Furthermore, they may only be turned over at that rate of payment for use as recreational or park purposes, and not for industrial or municipal administration purposes. On the floor of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania offered an amendment to which no objection at that time was made to the effect that property in excess of 500 acres should be thus sold to a municipality or a State. The conferees on the part of the House did their best in conference to support that proposal. It turned out, however, that there are many, many instances throughout the country where the 500-acre limitation would certainly cramp the legitimate desires of a State or municipality to acquire at 50 percent of its appraised value a tract of land for recreational or park purposes. Particularly is that true in the West, where there are portions of real estate far in excess of 500 acres and not worth much for any other purpose but park or recreational purposes. So the House conferees finally yielded on that point.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. If I understand the gentleman, the bill would simply authorize the transfer to the States of the land at 50 percent of its assessed value, for use for parks and recreational purposes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. COMBS. Is there any requirement in the bill that would forbid a State to sell this land, so that it might be used for private purposes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under the terms of the bill, the States may not dispose of them for any other purpose except park or recreational purposes.

Mr. COMBS. In other words, the purpose of the bill would be to authorize the establishing of parks under State supervision rather than Federal. Is that correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, in a sense, that is correct. At present, the Federal Government is not operating these parks or recreational facilities, but the States may do so if they purchase the land from the Federal Government.

Mr. COMBS. Would there be any requirement that the State operate them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If they cease to operate for the purposes outlined in this bill, they must turn them back.

Mr. COMBS. Then, it would be a very limited authority that would be conferred; simply to permit the use of these parks by the States for recreational purposes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is correct.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was there not something in the bill that they had to use them for recreational or park purposes for a period of 20 or more years? I had a recollection there was something like that in the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no present recollection of the 20-year period.

Mr. McCORMACK. Or some such period of time. Did I understand my friend to answer the question, asked by the gentleman from Texas, that when the State did take the land——

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; that is true. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman explain that? I am correct in what respect, that for all time they have to be used for recreational purposes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the intent of the act.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Does not this bill apply particularly to the vast acreage acquired during the war for military purposes, and if this bill in its present form is enacted into law, will it not be impossible for private owners of that land to ever acquire it back again, and it will not be possible to ever use that land for any purpose other than recreational purposes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The thing that disturbs me in regard to a bill of this kind, if we are placing limitations on properties acquired shortly before or during the war period, that sometime we will run up against a situation, particularly in the older sections of the country where we have national historic battle monuments—the question has come up before the committee of which I happen to be chairman over a period of several years, and we find that these old monuments, old battlegrounds, old forts, and areas of that kind that were taken over by the Government a century ago, particularly in our part of the country, as well as in the Midwest and in the South—if we are going to force the States to pay half the cost of the appraised value we are probably going to run those States into a lot of money.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman from Massachusetts is mistaken with respect to the treatment to be given to States and municipalities in connection with monuments or historic sites. In that instance, the property is to go without charge to the State or municipality.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. If that is clearly understood.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is expressly provided.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I recall that in my own district for a period of 2 or 3 years we have been trying to get a transfer of property back to a community where it has been declared surplus, and that little community had to pay for the land.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well. That cannot happen under this bill.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. If those national historic monuments are safeguarded in the public interest, that is satisfactory.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it possible that after we give this land to the States or the municipalities that they will then come in and make application for public parks, for national parks, and expect the Federal Government to take care of them? This has happened in many instances in the past in the case of lands that went to these various States. They then want the Federal Government to assume the responsibility of taking charge of them. What is there in the bill to prevent that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. This bill was reported from the Committee on Expenditures, of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a member. This bill would have no effect whatsoever on the Federal operation of parks and recreational areas. If anything is to be turned over to the States at all, the States must operate them.

Mr. RICH. I just want to drive that home so that the States and municipalities that purchase them do not come back and say that the Federal Government has got to take care of them. There is nothing in the bill that is supposed to permit that, and we want those people to realize that they have got to take care of them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is nothing in the bill that approaches any such thing.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. And I might say in the absence of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], who is chairman of the legal subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, that within the provisions of this bill are five or six projects on which the Armed Services Committee spent many days examining the transfer, for example, Fort Anthony Wayne, outside of Detroit, and many similar situations. Those bills all went to the Senate and the Senate saw fit as a result of that situation in order to cut out a lot of red tape and simplify the matter to bring in this resolution affecting all of these.

I may say also that our committee and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], and members of the legal subcommittee, which did so much work on these projects are wholeheartedly in accord with the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I make it perfectly clear that the objection of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has nothing whatsoever to do with historical sites or monuments. Apparently there is no objection about them at all, and without the adoption of this conference report or the passage of legislation closely paralleling it, none of them can be turned over.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Then why did not the conferees insist on keeping the amendment in this bill so that these five little worth-while projects could be dealt with together?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The conferees representing the House did their best on that question but the Senate would not yield, citing the fact that in several parts of the country the 500-acre limitation as to parks and recreational areas would absolutely nullify the bill.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. The House passed a bill some time ago whereby Fort Schuyler, which is presently used by the National Merchant Marine Academy would be transferred from Federal ownership to State ownership. It is now leased by the Federal Government to the State, and the Federal Government wanted to get back part of that territory for naval purposes. As I understand this bill, however such property that is to be turned over must be turned over for park or recreational purposes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Or as a historical monument or site.

Mr. LYNCH. This is neither a historical monument nor site; it is a Merchant Marine Academy and I am wondering whether or not although the Senate refused to report out this particular bill on the ground that it was included in this conference report, in view of the fact that it is neither a historical site nor a monument and will not be used for park or recreational purposes, it would be covered by this report?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It must be shown to be suitable for park or recreational purposes. If so shown the municipality or the State may purchase it at 50 percent of its appraised value. If not so shown it is not covered under this bill and would fall under the usual provision that permits sale of property at full value.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Is it not a fact that on many reservations that would come within the purview of this act if the conference report were adopted, there are improvements that cost the taxpayers of the United States millions of dollars? Among them are hospitals that should be used today by the Veterans' Administration instead of constructing new ones.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly the Veterans' Administration has the opportunity and will have the opportunity to buy those hospitals. There is nothing in this bill to prevent that.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address given by Mr. EBERHARTER.

Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from an official of the American Legion post in his district.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five instances and include excerpts.

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

CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5298) to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive, and insert:

"(a) to make available to Civil Air Patrol by gift or by loan, sale or otherwise, with or without charge therefor, obsolete or surplus aircraft, aircraft parts, matériel, supplies, and equipment of the Air Force Establishment;

"(b) to permit utilization of such facilities of the Air Force Establishment as, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Air Force, are required by the Civil Air Patrol to carry out its mission;

"(c) to furnish to Civil Air Patrol such quantities of gasoline and oil as may be required by it for the purpose of carrying out any specifically assigned mission."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)."

Page 2, line 18, strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)."

Page 2, line 25, strike out all after "Patrol" over to and including "services" in line 2 on page 3.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe in the reciprocal trade agreement principle. We are today proposing an extension of 1 year in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. In this bill we make one innovation, which I think is worth a trial and may prove highly successful.

Heretofore the information on which reciprocal trade agreements are based has been gathered by agreement on any particular commodity, say almonds, also are the ones who are interested in diplomacy and in building good will throughout the world. It seems to me that those two functions should be separated, or there is danger that some economic group—and I will again refer to almonds—may be traded out of their domestic market in order to build good will and perhaps develop a market for some other product. To protect our standard of living and the investment of our citizens—especially in small competitive enterprises—there must be some protection against low-wage products from countries with the low standards of living.

Consequently in this bill it is provided that the Tariff Commission hold the hearings and make the economic appraisal of what any suggested change may do. It is engaged in that sort of work now. Its members are statutory officers, with definite terms. It is a continuing and permanent body. Under this act it will have only one function, that is to advise the President of what the floor on reductions in tariff should be and what the ceiling should be and what any proposal would do to the economy of the product under consideration. I have the utmost faith that this body will make an objective and scholarly study and form independent judgments that will be realistic. Their conclusions will not be colored by what they think the effect of any particular recommendation will be on good will which we are trying to build. They wil not measure the conclusions they make by what effect it will have in building or hurting some other items which we wish to import or export.

I do not believe this will hurt, on the contrary I believe that it will strengthen, the reciprocal-trade principle. It will make agreements based on dispassionate studies which will clearly indicate whether or not any proposed agreement will be damaging or even ruinous to the business or product involved. We have need for such objective deductions in connection with the specialty crops of California. We also want to extend our

trade, but not in a manner that will unnecessarily injure any group or industry.

The extension is for a year. If it works as I expect it to, it will be continued. If not, I am positive that Congress will modify it but I also am sure that in no event will the reciprocal trade-agreement principle be abandoned.

HOUSING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish again to call to the attention of Members of the House petition No. 6 which I placed on the Speaker's desk early last year. It will bring to the floor of the House for consideration the long-range housing bill which has been worked on by both Republicans and Democrats, and which is sponsored by both Republicans and Democrats.

We have well over 100 signatures on the petition to date. I hope that all those who are aware of the critical shortage of homes in America will add their names to this petition so that the House may vote on this issue. Surely we have an obligation to the voters to be recorded in this matter. Mr. Speaker, I am fearful if housing is not passed in this session it will be another 3 years before we can begin to think of a housing program. There will be many new Members in the Eighty-first Congress. It will certainly not consider this long-range housing bill in the first year and probably not in the second year. In the meantime the population is increasing. I beg the Members to consider, Mr. Speaker, what the lack of homes today means in terms of family life. I ask the House to give consideration to this petition.

MEN ARE BORN FREE AND EQUAL

Mr. MULTER. 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. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1948, the State Department released an historical document. It is the agreement reached at the Ninth International Conference of American States at which 21 nations, the United Nations and the Pan-American Union were represented. I am not going to attempt to read all of the agreement, although I commend it to your attention in its entirety. I will merely read a part of the preamble and some of the articles of the first chapter.

The preamble starts with these significant words:

"All men are born free and equal, in dignity and in rights, and, being endowed by nature with reason and conscience, they should conduct themselves as brothers one to another."

The first four articles are as follows:

Every human being has the right to life, liberty, and the security of his person.

All persons are equal before the law and have the rights and duties established in this Declaration, without distinction as to race, sex, language, creed, or any other factor.

Every person has the right freely to profess a religious faith, and to manifest and practice it both in public and in private.

Every person has the right to freedom of investigation, of opinion, and of the expression and dissemination of thought, by any medium whatsoever.

Article 22 is as follows:

Every person has the right to associate with others to promote, exercise, and protect his legitimate interests of a political, economic, religious, social, cultural, professional, trade-union, or other nature.

The second part of article 26 is as follows:

Every person accused of an offense has the right to be given an impartial and public hearing, and to be tried by courts previously established in accordance with preexisting laws, and not to receive cruel, infamous, or unusual punishment.

I wonder if it was purely coincidental that the agreement was released for publication in this country during the week when the portion of the Bible read in every synagogue throughout the world was from the Book of Leviticus, dealing with the command of the Lord that all men are equal before the law and that the law must be the same for all.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an article on Okinawa and in the other a resolution.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works may sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECOND DECONTROL ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6659) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does the bill provide?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It continues certain of the temporary war powers under the Second War Powers Act. It will be recalled that about 90 days ago we continued it until May 31, with the idea that we might be able to get rid of some of the controls. This is a bill which continues controls on tin and tin products, antimony, fats and oils, rice and rice products, and nitrogenous fertilizer. It did, before the committee worked on the bill, continue controls on cinchona bark, quinine, and quinidine. We felt that the situation was such that we could very well take controls off of those, so we have eliminated them. At the present time the controls would be continued, if this bill is passed, on tin and tin products, antimony, fats and oils, rice and rice products, and certain other materials. The only controversy in the bill was with reference to fertilizer. We have made it possible, under this bill, for the American farmer, the domestic producer, indirectly to get a good portion, quite a large part of the fertilizer, nitrogenous fertilizers, which are being manufactured by the Department of the Army.

Mr. RICH. Has it not been demonstrated that the fertilizer industry of this country will be able to take care of our own domestic needs if we would not ship so much out of the country? I think it is about time that we get these decontrols out of the hands of the President. It seems to me the quicker we eliminate the power of control by the President on everything in this country, the better it is going to be. I am for it, and I want to do it, and I hate like everything to give him any extension of time, because I think we will work this thing out if we get this Government off of the necks of the people of this country.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say that the committee was in wholehearted accord with the gentleman's position, and we did just about that.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 (Public Law 188, 80th Cong.), and as further amended by the act of February 28, 1948 (Public Law 427, 80th Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out "May 31, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 28, 1949." Subsection (b) (1) (C) of such section 1501 is hereby repealed. Subsection (b) (1) (E) of such section 1501 is hereby amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia), in any form, necessary for the manufacture and delivery of the nitrogenous fertilizer materials required for such export: *Provided, however*, That 50 percent of the export requirements of nitrogenous fertilizer materials to nonoccupied areas shall be supplied out of nitrogenous fertilizer materials produced in plants operated by the Department of the Army, and notwithstanding any other provision of law the Department of the Army is authorized to produce such nitrogenous fertilizer materials to fill such 50 percent of such export requirements." Subsection (c) of such section 1501 is hereby amended by striking out "May 31, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 28, 1949."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 3 of the act entitled "An act to aid in the stabilization of commodity prices, to aid in further stabilizing the economy of the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 30, 1947, is hereby repealed.

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

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. McCORMACK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix].

FOREIGN TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 608 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 6556) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 78]

Anderson, Calif.	Ellsworth	Jenison
Bell	Engle, Calif.	Jennings
Bland	Fellows	Johnson, Okla.
Buckley	Gallagher	Johnson, Tex.
Bulwinkle	Gamble	Jones, N. C.
Clark	Grant, Ind.	Kefauver
Clason	Gwinn, N. Y.	Kennedy
Clippinger	Gwynne, Iowa	Kerr
Cole, Kans.	Hall,	Kersten, Wis.
Cotton	Edwin Arthur	Kilday
Davis, Tenn.	Hart	King
Dawson, Ill.	Hartley	Landis
Dolliver	Heffernan	Lane
Domengeaux	Hendricks	Lesinski
Durham	Holifield	Lusk
Lyle	Owens	Snyder
Mansfield	Pfeifer	Somers
Mason	Potter	Stigler
Meade, Ky.	Rayburn	Stockman
Miller, Calif.	Rivers	Stratton
Morrison	Robertson	Thomas, N. J.
Mundt	Scoblick	Thompson
Murray, Wis.	Sheppard	West
Norton	Short	Wilson, Tex.
O'Hara	Smathers	Youngblood
O'Toole	Smith, Maine	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 350 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. JENSEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2038), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KIRWAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Harvey W. Brown.

FOREIGN TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for 3 hours of general debate. It waives all points of order, and amendments are limited to those offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit.

I know that before long our good friends of the minority will have plenty to say about the Committee on Rules bringing in what they will call a gag rule. To you new Members, I would say that for many years under the able leadership of the former Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], we really did have gag rules. I remember the days when legislation was brought on the floor of this House and Members were not even able to cross a "t" or dot an "i." During the thirties we passed bills, and those bills were interpreted by the Chief Executive as he saw fit, and he was backed by a packed Supreme Court. So I say to you that although we are going to hear plenty today about gag rules, if you will look at the record you will find listed in a speech I made last year 37 rules that really were gag rules, that were brought out during sessions in the thirties.

The fact remains in regard to this bill that this is not a gag rule. There is only one question involved in the bill, and that is whether we should extend the reciprocal trade-agreements program for 1 year or 3 years. This rule provides for one motion to recommit. At the proper time the minority probably will offer a motion to recommit this bill, instructing the Committee on Ways and Means to bring in a 3-year extension. Therefore, the only issue involved here is whether the extension should be 1 or 3 years, and the minority will have the opportunity to express their views in the motion to recommit.

I want to compliment the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, especially our distinguished chairman [Mr. KNUTSON], and also Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. WOODRUFF, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Mr. MASON, Mr. GEARHART, and the others on the splendid work and thorough study they have given to every bill that has come out of that distinguished committee.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the House will vote to adopt this rule and that the bill itself, extending the reciprocal trade-agreements program for 1 year, will be passed.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that any rule which prevents amendments being offered to a bill is considered a gag rule?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. There has been much talk about a gag rule, but if the gentleman will go back to the 1930's, you will find some real gag rules where you could not even cross a "t" or dot an "i."

Mr. HARRIS. But does one sin justify another?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Perhaps in some instances, yes.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Does the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules know how he could draw any tighter or more closed rule than the one presented here today?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I do not presently know unless I were to go back to the 1930's and study some of the rules brought out in those days, and then I would probably be in a better position to do so.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows, of course, that whenever a reciprocal trade-agreements law or the extension of such agreements was brought up, we never had a gag rule or a closed rule, but they were all considered under the general rules of the House?

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. This is the situation about this rule. We have heard this line of argument down through the years. I have served on the Rules Committee for many years when Republicans as well as Democrats were in power. The party in power has often been accused by the minority, of bringing in a gag rule. You cannot write a good bill of

this kind or a tax bill or a tariff bill on the floor of the House. Everybody knows that. Under a rule such as this, what can happen? The majority has presented its bill. There will be a chance to vote "yes" or "no" on it. The minority who are opposed may offer a motion to recommit in which motion they can embody their philosophy and their version of a desirable bill. Thus there may be a vote between the two philosophies, one on the motion to recommit which may be called a minority bill, and the other on the majority philosophy which is contained in the bill reported by the majority. Therefore the House may work its will. There is an opportunity for a clean-cut vote between the philosophies of the two groups concerning the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It seems to me that the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, is devoting his entire time defending himself. He is the first one who has spoken on the rule, and he is on the defensive from the beginning. So you must have something on your mind when you are on the defensive.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I probably have in mind the tactics of a few of the minority members who are experts in the art of gag rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend has a little guilty conscience there.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would not say that, sir.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In reply to the gentleman from Michigan who says that you cannot write a bill of this kind on the floor, the fact is that every time such a bill as the present one has been considered heretofore, it was considered without a closed rule.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is it not true that before these bills were considered, your party, the then majority party, held a caucus, and you bound your Members to come to the floor and vote for the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. No, that is not true. The gentleman is a skillful and great legislator, but he can be mistaken.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of propounding an inquiry to my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], just what amendments he is in favor of in respect to the pending bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. What amendments?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am in favor of an extension of the existing law as it now stands.

Mr. HALLECK. That is for 3 years?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am in favor of the recommendation of the President for a 3-year extension.

Mr. HALLECK. Then may I say in response to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman from Illinois having yielded to me for that purpose, that the answer of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], makes it perfectly apparent that there is no one on the minority side who is interested in any amendment to the pending bill. The only thing you are interested in is an extension for 3 years without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i".

Why all this cry-baby stuff about this rule? We are trying to expedite the business of the House of Representatives. You do not care about individual provisions of this bill. All you want to do is to do what the people downtown ask you to do, which is a 3-year extension, without any change. Now you are going to have that opportunity under a motion to recommit. That ought to be enough to satisfy you.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], for those most appropriate remarks.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], states that we should go back to the thirties as to the closed rule. Has he reference to the gag rule that was brought in in the thirties on the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill—the bill that really brought about the greatest disaster to our country? That was a tariff bill. The Republicans brought it in under a gag rule. I concede that on tariff and revenue bills, when the Ways and Means Committee has agreed and asked unanimously for a closed rule, that it has been granted. But this is not a tariff bill. This is not a revenue bill. This is a bill that has been considered by the House four times without a closed rule. At all times it was considered under an open rule, giving the Members an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the bill and to vote for or against any provision in the bill.

I have been a member of the Rules Committee for a great many years, and a Member of this House for a great many years. This is the worst of all the closed rules I have ever observed.

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

Mr. SABATH. I regret I cannot yield at this time.

This rule will not even permit that the bill be read. It is a 7-page bill. You have to take it as is, without it even being read. It precludes any amendments.

The rule provides for 3 hours of debate, but that is the only privilege you have under the rule.

Now, I want to say, especially to the newer Members, I sympathize with a great many of you on that side, because you are being forced and driven and coaxed to vote for this rule against your own convictions, because you know that under this rule your privilege as Members, your rights, are being taken away, very likely on the theory that you new Members do not know anything about legislation and you should leave it to the big six on the Republican side under the direction and influence of the National Manufacturers Association, an association which at this time does not represent the business of the country, because the business and the country are 95 percent for the extension of this legislation that has worked so well in the interest of our country, and under which we have been able to increase our exports and our business. A recent Gallup poll shows that 80 percent of the people are for and only 8 percent against the extension of the present law; that all the large metropolitan newspapers, with the exception of three of them, are for it; and that businessmen throughout the country are for its continuation for 3 years and without change. Labor and consumer organizations also approve the continuation of the present law.

The large combines seek special tariff consideration, and like to maintain the fiction that their growth is the result of free enterprise. Perhaps it will benefit them if legislation of this nature is passed, but the majority of American businesses cannot benefit.

A great Secretary of State, Secretary Cordell Hull, lifted this question out of politics, to the benefit of the Nation as a whole. To pass legislation of this nature will be to sabotage the effort and work of a great many years.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point as part of my remarks a letter received from Mr. H. P. Stewart, an outstanding businessman, of Chicago, which is one of the hundreds which I have received urging the extension of the law without change for a period of 3 years. Mr. Stewart gives most effective reasons for the continuation of the law. His letter is as follows:

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 19, 1948.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We believe you should know that those of us who have devoted years furthering our foreign trade feel that there has never been a piece of legislation so helpful to our trade as that provided under the reciprocal trade-agreements program.

Now that the United States is the only solvent creditor nation, it is incumbent upon us to see that the well-conceived and proven Reciprocal Trade Act is renewed without amendments and for the full 3-year period. This latter is all the more important if the billions of dollars for foreign aid do not become an idle gesture, and we lose the necessary expansion of world trade, without which other nations cannot reach economic stability. Those of us in the country will lose the results of our years of effort in catering to the needs of other countries, and the vital benefits of foreign trade will be lost to the United States.

This country has a new role to act on the world stage; it is and must be the unquestioned leader. Any change whatsoever in the reciprocal-agreements program at this time would be ill-advised and most certainly spoil the show.

Your support of this program in Congress will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

H. P. STEWART.

Every man who is not seeking special privilege under a high tariff is for the extension of this legislation as it is for 3 years, because under the present law our foreign economic structure has ex-

panded and our foreign business has increased tremendously. This bill, if enacted, will impair our foreign economic policy and make a political football out of this vital, all-important policy that will destroy our world economic leadership.

This bill has not even been considered by the Ways and Means Committee. The minority members of the Ways and Means Committee did not even have the privilege of sitting in during the 6 days the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee were considering it behind closed doors. I know some of you believe in that kind of practice, but you will not be able to explain it to the public and to the people at home. I actually am sorry for some of you newer Members, because, as I have stated, you will not be able to explain it to your constituency. I know that if you were not forced and clubbed into submission at least 15 to 20 percent of the Republican membership would vote against the rule and against the bill, and for the extension for 3 years.

In view of the importance of this matter, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we should vote down the previous question. By voting down the previous question you will have an opportunity to vote on the provisions of the bill that you in your heart feel should be eliminated, and will have the right to extend this splendid legislation for an additional 3 years.

In case we should not succeed in defeating the previous question, I, of course, am going to ask all those who believe in fair play and who have the interest of the people at heart to vote against the rule and thus give the Members of this body an opportunity, which is theirs under the Constitution, to vote on this important legislation according to their conscience and dictates of their hearts.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have only one more request for time. Will the gentleman use more of his time?

Mr. SABATH. Is that all the gentleman has on that side who are willing to speak on this gag rule?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that a serious effort should be made to force consideration of this important legislation under this type of closed or gag rule. No such effort has ever been made before. This is the fifth time that this type of legislation has been considered here in the House. There has never been a closed rule on this type of bill, there has never been any rule for this type of legislation except on one occasion which was to fix time for general debate. On every other occasion this legislation has been presented to the House for consideration under an open rule and under the general rules of the House of Representatives. Next to the last time that this legislation was considered, as the designated parliamentarian of the Ways and Means Committee, I made 10 points of order against important amendments offered from the floor, most of them from the other side of the House.

The last time it was under consideration I made perhaps a greater number of points of order against amendments offered. Each time every Member of this House had full and ample opportunity to offer any amendment to the legislation that he saw fit. There never has been a closed rule for the consideration of legislation of this type.

Mr. Speaker, what is the majority afraid of? Are you afraid of this Democratic minority? No; that is not it. You are afraid to give your own Members an opportunity to express their views in an effort to amend this important legislation. It is the same thing that happened during consideration of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill in 1930. I sat here and saw the Republican leadership at that time bring in a closed rule like the present rule presented here today, not allowing a single Member of their own party to offer an amendment to that measure. Fifteen Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee had met behind closed doors and drafted the legislation, excluding all other members of their party and all Democratic members. The then Republican leader of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. John Tilson, publicly stated that the Republican leadership did not propose to allow every Tom, Dick, and Harry an opportunity to offer amendments to the legislation. You are repeating that performance today.

What happened? The very next time the authors of the bill came before the people they were defeated. You know the results to the country and to the trade of this Nation of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill.

The question is presented here today: Shall the House have the opportunity of considering this legislation as it has on every occasion in the past, and will the Members have a chance to offer amendments that they think should be offered to this bill? This program has been successful for the last 14 years. It has the most overwhelming support of the American people, of the press, of business organizations, of labor organizations, of consumer groups, of every segment of the people of this country, of almost any legislation that has been passed.

In its far-reaching consequences to the future welfare and the interests of the people of this country, this is in many respects the most important legislation to be considered during this Congress.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the previous question should be voted down, and we can then offer an amendment to the rule making it an open one like it has always been in the past, giving all Members the opportunity to offer amendments. If the previous question is ordered, then the rule should be voted down so that we may consider this legislation under the general rules of the House, in fairness to every Member here, so that he may be given an opportunity to offer amendments and to express his views in reference to this legislation.

So I submit in all fairness that this rule should be voted down and the Members given the opportunity to express their views, and at least have a chance to vote on important amendments to improve this legislation.

The statement has been made here by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that tariff and tax legislation cannot be considered under an open rule. Well, the facts stand out in bold relief that this legislation has been considered on four different occasions under an open rule, and the will of the House was expressed.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, when it was considered under an open rule the Democratic Party had a rubber-stamp majority. Those were the days of rubber-stamping, when "must" legislation came down from the White House and they just voted it out.

Mr. COOPER. The question is: Are you afraid of your own Members? Are you afraid to give the men on your side of the House a chance to offer amendments to your bill?

Mr. GEARHART. We have no rubber-stamping on this side of the House.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, whatever action is taken by the House today will be broadcast to the four corners of the world. Should this House pass H. R. 6556 we will be telling the world that the United States of America has decided to change its policy insofar as trade with the world is concerned. We shall be telling the world that we are backtracking, that we intend to go back to the old days of that scandalous log-rolling practice of writing tariffs, that we are going back into isolationism, and that we intend to build high-tariff walls. We have condemned other countries because they have erected trade barriers against us in the past, and now we will invite them, by this bill, to do the same thing over again.

Now, perhaps many of you will say, "Well, this man is not talking on the rule. He is talking on the bill." That is true, Mr. Speaker, but I do so because I want to bring to your attention the fact that under the rule now being considered the result will be disastrous to our country.

I am sorry to note that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules said—and I am sure he did not mean to say what he did—that this legislation posed only one question, the question of extension of time from 1 to 3 years, because if he will look at page 2 of the report he will see that there are eight different points listed where changes are provided. To adopt the rule means just what has been said by the previous speakers; it is a gag.

I sympathize with my friends on the left for being whipped into line, for being kept under the lash, because I know that many of you feel, as we on this side

feel, that there should be a 3-year extension in this bill, because you realize, as we do, that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is the pivot for our world-recovery program. You realize also, I am sure, that this is not only sabotage of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, it is killing the act outright. But apparently you do not have the courage to let this act expire. If you want to do that, why not come out like men and say, "We are opposed to it definitely." But, oh, no, you say, "We are in favor of the reciprocal trade agreements program, but"; and oh, my, what that "but" means.

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

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I call attention to the fact that no Members other than those on the Committee on Ways and Means will have an opportunity to debate this bill on the floor because there will be no debate under the 5-minute rule. If the 180 minutes of general debate are evenly divided among the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, they will have only 7 minutes apiece to debate this most important piece of legislation, and no other Member will have an opportunity to say a word.

Mr. FORAND. I thank my friend for that comment. The reason I am speaking on the rule instead of on the bill is to make it possible for others to get a chance to say a word. I am pleading, I am begging all of you who believe in fair play and honesty to vote against the motion for the previous question on this rule so that there may be an opportunity to consider the bill under the general rules of the House, as has been done in the past. If you do not do that, then the world will fully recognize how true is what the newspaper editorials of this country have been saying right along, that the Republican Party, following its historic practice, is opposed to the reciprocal trade agreements program, and that this is just administering a slow death to the program. General Marshall in his letter which many of you have seen, I am sure, tells you the same thing. It is better to have no bill at all, no reciprocal trade agreements extension at all, than to have this legislation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a vote for this rule is a vote to extend the reciprocal trade agreements program, and make no mistake about it. The Eightieth Congress has been one of the busiest Congresses in the history of this Republic. There has been labor legislation and all manner of broad, sweeping legislation. We are undertaking currently to consider a home-rule bill for the District of Columbia. Our work this session has been local, national, and international. More legislation has been before this Congress than any other Congress in a long time.

The trade-agreements law expires on June 12. Next Tuesday is June 1. The Republican majority of this Congress has taken this procedure to extend the trade-agreements program. It must go through with expedition; it must go through without crippling amendments, and it must go through now. If you are for the extension of the reciprocal trade-agreements program you must be for this rule and must be against voting down the previous question.

If the previous question is voted down, a substitute rule will be considered under which considerable latitude will be given to bring in all manner of amendments relating to the tariff. It involves quotas, it involves rates, it involves other matters. I say to the gentlemen on my right, if you want the trade-agreements program extended, then vote for the rule that will make it possible to extend it and get it through the other body and have it signed by the President before June 12.

There has been all sort of loose talk around the country about this program. It has been said that no hearings were held. There were 7 weeks of open hearings. The hearings were published, and no one was denied the right to come and say what he wanted to say in reference to this program. This program is being extended. True, some minor corrective amendments are inserted. It cannot be said that any unreasonable amendments have been attached to this bill. The program continues. Then what is the issue between the minority and the majority? Apparently it is a question of time. As a matter of fact, I doubt very much if the minority will offer a motion to recommit extending this program for 3 years because they have established a precedent that each Congress gets a chance to look at this program. Their last extension was for 2 years. I do not think the Members on the minority side will vote to take this out of the hands of the Eighty-first Congress.

Why has the majority recommended an extension of a little over a year? There are very good reasons for that. In the first place, if the next Congress is to look at this, they ought to look at it early in the session. It should not be one of those hurried matters just before an adjournment in an election year. So far as I am concerned, I think all of this legislation that expires periodically should be so timed that it expires in the odd-numbered years. I think that would be orderly procedure. There are other very important reasons why this law should be extended only for about a year and 20 days. One reason is that it is related to the European recovery program. The Congress has already proceded on the basis that ERP shall be looked at each year beginning the end of June. It may turn out as that program develops that you will want some changes, some additions to or some subtractions from the program. The two should be handled together. They should be considered next year. There is another and larger reason why this program should be considered next year: Congress will have before it the charter of the International Trade Organization. It is a composite, far-reaching trade agreement, if you please. What the Congress will do with it, I do not know. I do not know whether it has been ascertained what committee will have jurisdiction of it. But it will be here—a major feature in our whole international program. It will be before the Congress for consideration. Certainly our general reciprocal trade agreements program should coincide with ITO. Certainly Congress should deal with both matters. I am sure that every person in the land who has throughout the years made a study of the reciprocal trade-agreements program, who is familiar with the law, and who has investigated the agreements that have been entered into, realizes that the reciprocal trade-agreements program is part and parcel of our foreign relief program. The two should be considered together.

It is unfortunate that in the closing days of this Congress, when we are trying to extend the reciprocal-trade-agreement program for another year, that partisan efforts to harass, delay, and bring in amendments of all sorts should be carried on on this floor.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. A moment ago reference was made to the fact that this is the 26th day of May, and the Trade Agreement Act expires on the 12th of June. Why is it we waited from the beginning of this Congress until now to bring it up?

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman knows that we have had a very heavy program in this House. The Committee on Ways and Means has been very busy considering trade agreements, taxes, and social security.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I know the gentleman wants to keep the RECORD straight.

Mr. CURTIS. Very much so.

Mr. DINGELL. Let me remind the gentleman that the President had sent three previous messages during this session with regard to social security amendments.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman from Nebraska made a mistake in mentioning social security, because we do not want to sidetrack the issue. The fact remains that you have a chance to extend the reciprocal trade agreements program today. If you vote down the previous question, you vote for harassing delays.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I understood the gentleman had just received permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Would the gentleman include the 37 gag rules that the gentleman reported?

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman consider that a wise or constructive contribution?

Mr. Speaker, let us have no misunderstanding about the question of closed rules. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], himself is the one who used the phrase "gag rule." The Ways

and Means Committee, under Democratic control, never asked for a closed rule unless all members of the committee joined in the request. Get that, now. I served on that committee for 10 years. We never asked for a closed rule unless the Democrats and Republicans on the committee voted to direct the chairman of the committee to request such a rule from the Committee on Rules.

This matter has been before the Congress five times. We never asked for a closed rule. The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] whom I like very well, but who impulsively makes statements such as offended the good woman's organization of this country, a moment ago referred to the landslide majority of the Democratic Party in past Congresses.

That certainly is not a reason and is a far-fetched justification. But, in 1945, we had about the same membership in this branch as the Republican Party has now. We did not ask for a closed rule then.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield briefly for a question, not a speech.

Mr. GEARHART. I will state it then in the form of a question. The Democratic Party has a caucus system which binds its members to vote.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely mistaken in the fact that the Democratic Party has ever exercised a binding upon its members. In my 20 years of experience, on one occasion only—and that was about 18 years ago—did the Democratic Party use it; and the Democratic Party releases a man if a binding is contrary to a campaign promise.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman will admit that the Republican Party has no caucuses under any conditions. They only hold conferences and every member of the Republican Party is free to vote his own particular viewpoint; and he always does.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is that so?

Mr. GEARHART. That is so.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want that for the RECORD? Does he think he can fool everybody?

Mr. GEARHART. I have said it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's idea of being able to josh everybody is a very strong one. The gentleman had better consult himself and develop in such statements as that a little more intellectual honesty.

Mr. GEARHART. I have been a Member of Congress for 14 years and have never been asked or told to vote on any question any particular way.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from California does not have to be told; he follows like a sheep.

Mr. GEARHART. That statement, coming from a Democrat, seems silly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, Mr. Speaker, the 1-year proposition is not the question involved here. If that were the only question involved we could get together on it. If extending the law 1 year or 3 years were the issue involved there is no question but what we could get together. What is involved here is a repudiation of the whole reciprocal trade agreements program; that is what is involved. Not long ago the New York Times in an editorial tersely presented the issue. It said:

> The coming contest will provide an interesting and particularly timely answer to the question of how far the Republican Party has emerged from prewar isolationism in its thinking on international economic issues in this election year.

Some years ago there came from the State of Tennessee a man who will go down in history as one of the great Americans of all time and one of the outstanding Secretaries of State not only of our constitutional history to date but for all time to come. I refer to Cordell Hull. Cordell Hull served as a Member of this body; he served as a Member of the United States Senate for many years with outstanding distinction; he served as Secretary of State. In this body, in the other body, and as Secretary of State, he recognized the evils of high protective tariffs, and he fought for years in an effort to remedy those evils. He saw his years of effort consummated successfully some 12 to 14 years ago when the first reciprocal trade agreements law passed Congress and became law. He has seen it in successful operation during those years.

Cordell Hull is now on his sickbed and has been for about 2 years. He now sees his effort and great contributions of the last 12 to 14 years now threatened with destruction. Yesterday I received, written from his sickbed at the naval hospital in Bethesda, a letter coming from the fighter, Cordell Hull, the fighter in this body, the fighter in the Senate, the fighter as Secretary of State, and now on his sickbed still fighting for this great program of his that years ago was only a dream.

Yesterday Cordell Hull from his sickbed sent me the following letter:

> MAY 25, 1948.
>
> DEAR MR. McCORMACK: I have your note informing me that the House of Representatives will debate tomorrow the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It is my firm belief that the present act as it stands upon the statute books should be renewed for the 3-year period without crippling amendments. The reasons for this conviction are set forth in a statement which I prepared only a short time ago, a copy of which I am making available to you. From the inception of this program, in the enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1934, both I and my associates, Democrats and Republicans alike who have supported this program, have kept it entirely free from partisan, political considerations.

That is the letter from Cordell Hull, the fighter of years, speaking to you and me from his sickbed, urging that the present program be continued for 3 years. All we ask is what we gave you my Republican colleagues, on this question. Five different times this bill has been before the House. We always gave to the Republican Party an open rule. That is all we are asking for, nothing more, and we think we are entitled to nothing less. Decency, if nothing else, calls for that, and I rest my case on the ground of decency, that what we have given to the Republican Party in the consideration of this bill on five different occasions we are entitled to on this occasion, so that when the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole and it comes to the consideration of this bill under the 5-minute rule, we might have the opportunity under the rules of the House and the Committee of the Whole to offer germane amendments and to have the Committee of the Whole pass upon those amendments. We are asking only that which we gave.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, based not only upon judgment and conscience, but based upon decency we are entitled to that consideration.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the statements of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] about decency, and I suppose he means we are not being very decent to them in this proposed procedure. Well, I first came to Congress in 1935 and the other side of the aisle gave me a little education on this type of procedure. I just looked up the record.

We had a closed rule on the work relief appropriation bill and the extension of NRA, which was considered one of the great accomplishments of that time. We had a closed rule on the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and even on the Blue Ridge Parkway. In the Seventy-sixth Congress there was a closed rule on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, and they brought in a closed rule in connection with extension of the Sugar Act. As recent as the last Congress they had us consider the Social Security Act amendments under a closed rule.

I did not mean to be harsh when I said a moment ago, "Let us quit the crybaby stuff." We all know that this rule is not at all unusual. Everyone understands that we are trying to expedite the business of the House of Representatives. We are going to nominate the next President of the United States in June in Philadelphia. Mark you me, I said June. In July the Democrats are going to nominate somebody who will run but not get to be the next President. Everyone wants the Congress to complete its program as soon as possible, and that is what we are trying to do.

But now, apart from all of this talk about closed rules, what is the true situation? From what has been said here today I conclude that there is no one on the Democratic side of the aisle who has any interest in amending any particular provision of this bill. There may be some such interest on this side, but I think by and large our side of the aisle is pretty well agreed on this proposal. We think the proposal presented here is a good one.

I understand that you gentlemen on the other side of the aisle held a conference, or had some sort of a steering committee meeting, and you did not talk about amending this bill, which we would be doing under a wide open rule. You just met and agreed that you were going to take the administration's proposal without crossing a "t" or dotting an

"1." You are for a 3-year extension and nothing else. Now you are going to have a chance to bring that matter to a vote under the motion to recommit. So why try to fool the people and the country about what is going on here? I do not think it comes with very good grace.

Now, what about this bill? As the gentleman from Nebraska has so well said, it is an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I have heard some reckless statements made here today, and I have heard some reckless statements made by people who are important in the conduct of the foreign affairs of this country, utterly reckless and irresponsible, when they say they would rather have nothing at all than this extension. Such statements also come with poor grace with respect to a Republican Congress that has cooperated with a Democratic administration and a Democratic Secretary of State in carrying forward the foreign affairs program of this country. I, for one, resent it, and I want, as far as I am concerned, the people to understand that those statements are reckless.

Now then, if you have any question about it, turn to page 2 of the report and you will see there side by side in columns the operation under the present method and the operation under the proposed method. About all that is done in the way of change is that we substitute the Tariff Commission for this Committee for Reciprocity Information, and then provide that the President shall pay some attention in the final negotiations to the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission is an independent agency of the Government. The members are appointed by the President, so I assume he has confidence in them. He certainly ought to have confidence in them, and you people on that side of the aisle ought to have confidence in them.

A lot of people in the country thought that the Republican Congress, when we convened here a year ago last January, ought to work over the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. That was not done, but there were negotiations made, I guess it is proper to say now, with the State Department, looking to some sort of betterment of the operations for the protection of our own national self-interest, recognizing as we do our responsibility to promote trade in the world. What were those negotiations? Why, they had to do with escape clauses to be written into these agreements. Yes; that had to do with an added responsibility of the Tariff Commission. So, there again, why all this dragging of the red herring across the trail and this attempt to say that this is a complete sabotage of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act? It just is not true, and anyone with any understanding ought to know that.

As far as I am concerned, I think this is a good bill. It is probably fair to say that there are some Members on both sides of the aisle, who if they were just voting their individual convictions with no recognition to the fact that all legislation is a matter of compromise, that would not want to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act at all. Others would like just to throw the door wide open.

I think the Committee on Ways and Means has worked out a fair and effective compromise that will carry forward the idea of true reciprocity, which is what the Republicans adhere to, and doubtless a lot of Democrats also. This bill will carry forward that sort of program; but, at the same time, it will afford to the people of this country some measure of protection. The little business people in your own districts have just as much right to live as anyone else any place in the world. This will give them some measure of protection, this will give them some opportunity to be heard, and it will assure the carrying forward of the program.

One year or three years? What should be the period of extension? Why, you would have us believe that if the act is not extended for 3 years the world is going to come to an end, yet you just extended it for 2 years the last time. What sort of double talk is that? If it is extended for 1 year they will go on to make these agreements. However, some well-informed people have told me that after all this is probably an academic matter, that except for a few loose ends here and there the whole trade-agreement program has been perfected and carried out. They say that there is very little more to be done, if anything. Whether that is true or not, this is an extension for a year, and that ought to be sufficient. I know it is sufficient.

I know that maybe we are a little overzealous in pressing this cause. The previous question is not going to be voted down. This rule will be adopted and we will proceed to the debate on the measure. You will have your motion to recommit, you folks, who, as I say, would not cross a "t" or dot an "i" to what the administration suggests. We have had too much of that sort of legislating in the past. For the first time in a long time the people of this country have a Congress that is responsive to the will of the people and is not taking dictation from the Executive or from the bureaucrats down town or from any segment of the population or any pressure group anywhere. This is a Congress that is doing a good job for the American people. We are doing a good job for the American people, yes, and for the world, in this action that is here proposed today. Do not have any fear about it. This proposed bill is sound in every respect.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the previous question be ordered?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McCORMACK) there were—ayes 154, noes 102.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 212, nays 156, answered "present" 3, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—212

Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Auchincloss
Bakewell
Banta
Barrett
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bradley
Bramblett
Brehm
Brophy
Brown, Ohio
Buck
Buffett
Burke
Busbey
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Coffin
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Corbett
Coudert
Crawford
Crow
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dondero
Eaton
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fenton
Fletcher
Foote
Fuller
Fulton
Gallagher
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillette
Gillie
Goff
Goodwin
Graham
Griffiths
Gross
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Hand
Harness, Ind.
Harvey
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes
Hope
Jackson, Calif.
Jenkins, Ohio
Jenkins, Pa.
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Jones, Wash.
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Keefe
Kilburn
Knutson
Kunkel
Latham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lewis, Ky.
Lewis, Ohio
Lichtenwalter
Lodge
Love
McConnell
McCowen
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McGarvey
McGregor
McMahon
McMillen, Ill.
Mack
MacKinnon
Macy
Maloney
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Mathews
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mitchell
Morton
Muhlenberg
Nicholson
Nixon
Nodar
Norblad
O'Konski
Patterson
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Ploeser
Plumley
Potts
Poulson
Ramey
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Reeves
Rich
Riehlman
Rizley
Rockwell
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Stratton
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Tibbott
Tollefson
Towe
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Welch
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Woodruff
Youngblood

NAYS—156

Abbitt
Abernethy
Albert
Allen, La.
Andrews, Ala.
Barden
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Bland
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Bonner
Boykin
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley
Burleson
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carroll
Celler
Chapman
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Courtney
Cox
Cravens
Crosser
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn
Deane
Delaney
Dingell
Domengeaux
Donohue
Dorn
Doughton
Douglas
Eberharter
Elliott
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Grant, Ala.
Gregory
Hardy
Harless, Ariz.
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hays
Hébert
Hedrick
Hobbs
Huber
Isacson
Jackson, Wash.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten, Mo.
Kee
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kirwan
Klein
Lanham
Larcade
Lea
Lesinski
Lucas
Ludlow
Lynch
McCormack
McMillan, S. C.
Madden
Mahon
Manasco
Mansfield

Marcantonio	Philbin	Smathers
Meade, Md.	Pickett	Smith, Va.
Mills	Poage	Spence
Monroney	Powell	Stanley
Morgan	Preston	Teague
Morris	Price, Fla.	Thomas, Tex.
Multer	Price, Ill.	Thompson
Murdock	Priest	Trimble
Murray, Tenn.	Rankin	Vinson
Norrell	Redden	Walter
Norton	Regan	Wheeler
O'Brien	Richards	Whitaker
O'Toole	Rogers, Fla.	Whitten
Pace	Rooney	Whittington
Passman	Sabath	Williams
Patman	Sadowski	Winstead
Peden	Sasscer	Wood
Peterson	Sikes	Worley

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Chadwick	Halleck	Hull

NOT VOTING—60

Anderson, Calif.	Holifield	Murray, Wis.
Bell	Horan	O'Hara
Bulwinkle	Jarman	Owens
Clippinger	Javits	Pfeifer
Cole, Kans.	Jenison	Potter
Cotton	Johnson, Okla.	Rains
Dawson, Ill.	Johnson, Tex.	Rayburn
Dirksen	Jones, N. C.	Rees
Dolliver	Kefauver	Riley
Durham	Kersten, Wis.	Rivers
Engle, Calif.	Kilday	Robertson
Fellows	King	Scoblick
Gamble	Landis	Sheppard
Granger	Lane	Short
Grant, Ind.	Lusk	Smith, Maine
Gwinn, N. Y.	Lyle	Somers
Gwynne, Iowa	Meade, Ky.	Stigler
Hartley	Miller, Calif.	Thomas, N. J.
Heffernan	Morrison	West
Hendricks	Mundt	Wilson, Tex.

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Rayburn against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Gwinn of New York for, with Mrs. Lusk against.

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Scoblick for, with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma against.

Mr. Clippinger for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. Gwynne of Iowa for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Cotton for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Fellows for, with Mr. Granger against.

Mr. Grant of Indiana for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Jenison for, with Mr. Kilday against.

Mr. Owens for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Somers against.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky for, with Mr. Riley against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Wilson of Texas against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Cole of Kansas with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Horan with Mr. Lyle.

Mr. Mundt with Mr. Rains.

Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. Landis with Mr. Durham.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I have a pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RAYBURN, who is necessarily detained. If he were present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I, therefore, withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 166, answered "present" 5, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—197

Allen, Calif.	Gallagher	Merrow
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Meyer
Andersen, H. Carl	Gearhart	Michener
	Gillette	Miller, Md.
Andresen, August H.	Gillie	Miller, Nebr.
	Goff	Mitchell
Andrews, N. Y.	Goodwin	Muhlenberg
Angell	Graham	Nicholson
Arends	Griffiths	Nodar
Arnold	Gross	Norblad
Auchincloss	Hagen	O'Konski
Banta	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Patterson
Barrett		Phillips, Calif.
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Leonard W.	Phillips, Tenn.
Beall		Ploeser
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Plumley
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey	Potts
Bennett, Mo.	Herter	Ramey
Bishop	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Boggs, Del.	Hinshaw	Rees
Bolton	Hoeven	Reeves
Bradley	Hoffman	Rich
Bramblett	Holmes	Riehlman
Brehm	Hope	Rizley
Brophy	Horan	Rockwell
Brown, Ohio	Jackson, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Buck	Jenkins, Ohio	Rohrbough
Buffett	Jennings	Ross
Burke	Jensen	Russell
Busbey	Johnson, Calif.	Sadlak
Butler	Johnson, Ill.	St. George
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Ind.	Sanborn
Canfield	Jones, Wash.	Sarbacher
Carson	Jonkman	Schwabe, Mo.
Case, S. Dak.	Kean	Schwabe, Okla.
Chenoweth	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Chiperfield	Kearns	Scrivner
Church	Keefe	Seely-Brown
Clason	Kilburn	Shafer
Clevenger	Knutson	Simpson, Ill.
Coffin	Kunkel	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, Mo.	Latham	Smith, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Lea	Smith, Ohio
Corbett	LeCompte	Smith, Wis.
Coudert	LeFevre	Snyder
Crawford	Lemke	Stevenson
Crow	Lewis, Ky.	Stockman
Cunningham	Lewis, Ohio	Stratton
Curtis	Lichtenwalter	Sundstrom
Dague	Love	Taber
Davis, Wis.	McConnell	Talle
Dawson, Utah	McCowen	Taylor
D'Ewart	McCulloch	Tibbott
Dondero	McDonough	Tollefson
Eaton	McDowell	Towe
Elliott	McGarvey	Twyman
Ellis	McGregor	Vail
Ellsworth	McMahon	Van Zandt
Elsaesser	McMillen, Ill.	Vursell
Elston	Mack	Wadsworth
Engel, Mich.	MacKinnon	Welch
Fenton	Macy	Wigglesworth
Fletcher	Maloney	Wilson, Ind.
Foote	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Fuller	Mason	Wolverton
Fulton	Mathews	Woodruff

NAYS—166

Abbitt	Case, N. J.	Durham
Abernethy	Celler	Eberharter
Albert	Chapman	Evins
Allen, La.	Chelf	Feighan
Andrews, Ala.	Clark	Fernandez
Bakewell	Colmer	Fisher
Barden	Combs	Flannagan
Bates, Ky.	Cooley	Fogarty
Battle	Cooper	Folger
Beckworth	Courtney	Forand
Bland	Cox	Garmatz
Blatnik	Cravens	Gary
Bloom	Crosser	Gathings
Boggs, La.	Davis, Ga.	Gordon
Bonner	Davis, Tenn.	Gore
Brooks	Deane	Gorski
Brown, Ga.	Delaney	Gossett
Bryson	Devitt	Granger
Buchanan	Dingell	Grant, Ala.
Buckley	Domengeaux	Gregory
Byrne, N. Y.	Donohue	Hale
Camp	Dorn	Hand
Cannon	Doughton	Hardy
Carroll	Douglas	Harless, Ariz.
Harris	McMillan, S. C.	Priest
Harrison	Madden	Rains
Hart	Mahon	Rankin
Havenner	Manasco	Redden
Hays	Mansfield	Regan
Hedrick	Marcantonio	Richards
Hendricks	Meade, Md.	Rogers, Fla.
Heselton	Miller, Conn.	Rooney
Hobbs	Mills	Sabath
Huber	Monroney	Sadowski
Isacson	Morgan	Sasscer
Jackson, Wash.	Morris	Sikes
Jarman	Morton	Smathers
Jones, Ala.	Multer	Smith, Va.
Judd	Murdock	Spence
Karsten, Mo.	Murray, Tenn.	Stanley
Keating	Norrell	Teague
Kee	Norton	Thomas, Tex.
Kelley	O'Brien	Thompson
Kennedy	O'Toole	Trimble
Keogh	Pace	Vinson
Kerr	Passman	Walter
Kirwan	Patman	Weichel
Klein	Peden	Wheeler
Lanham	Peterson	Whitten
Larcade	Philbin	Whittington
Lesinski	Pickett	Williams
Lodge	Poage	Winstead
Lucas	Powell	Wood
Ludlow	Preston	Worley
Lynch	Price, Fla.	
McCormack	Price, Ill.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Chadwick	Hull	Vorys
Halleck	Jenkins, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—63

Anderson, Calif.	Javits	Potter
Bell	Jenison	Poulson
Boykin	Johnson, Okla.	Rayburn
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Tex.	Riley
Burleson	Jones, N. C.	Rivers
Clippinger	Kefauver	Robertson
Cole, Kans.	Kersten, Wis.	Scoblick
Cotton	Kilday	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Dawson, Ill.	King	
Dirksen	Landis	Sheppard
Dolliver	Lane	Short
Engle, Calif.	Lusk	Smith, Maine
Fallon	Lyle	Somers
Fellows	Meade, Ky.	Stefan
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Stigler
Grant, Ind.	Morrison	Thomas, N. J.
Gwinn, N. Y.	Mundt	West
Gwynne, Iowa	Murray, Wis.	Whitaker
Hartley	Nixon	Wilson, Tex.
Hébert	O'Hara	Youngblood
Heffernan	Owens	
Holifield	Pfeifer	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Rayburn against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Vorys against.

Mr. Gwinn of New York for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Gwynne of Iowa for, with Mrs. Lusk against.

Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Grant of Indiana for, with Mr. Burleson against.

Mr. Fellows for, with Mr. Fallon against.

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Somers against.

Mr. Owens for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. Scoblick for, with Mr. Riley against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Jenison for, with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Clippinger for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Lyle.

Mr. Meyer with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. Mundt with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Nixon with Mr. Bulwinkle.
Mr. Youngblood with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Stefan with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Cole of Kansas with Mr. Kilday.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. POTTER. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I have a pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RAYBURN, who is unavoidably detained. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. MCDOWELL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

FOREIGN-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. WOODRUFF. 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. 6556) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6556, with Mr. COLE of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, after conducting what must be regarded as the most painstaking investigation into the administration and operations of the Trade Agreements Act, an investigation which extended over 7 weeks of open public hearings, to which everyone interested was invited and at which every interested person in the United States who desired to be heard was heard, and 6 days of intensive executive sessions with the advice and guidance of acknowledged experts on foreign trade, the Committee on Ways and Means has presented to this Congress this bill we have under consideration, a bill for the extension of the trade agreements program, with certain definite, constructive, and improving amendments, devised in the light of 14 years' experience in the administration of the Trade Agreements Act.

In my years of membership in this body, my attention has never been called to a more careful study of a legislative subject under investigation by any legislative committee of the Congress. I feel confident, in tendering this bill to the Congress and to the American people, we are offering a legislative procedure governing the execution of trade agreements which will result in better agreements and a more enthusiastic support of the program during the days that lie ahead. The first, and one of the most important consequences of the enactment of this bill will be the removal of the program from the sphere of partisanship under which it has been manipulated down through the years and convert it into a nonpartisan American procedure. That is very important.

The Republican Party, sacrificing its views in many, many instances, has given its support to the administration in its foreign policy. In the main, they have gone along hand in hand with the administration, accepting administration leadership adjourning politics at the water's edge as we have faced the outside world. I am sorry the administration did not see fit to reciprocate just a little and go along with the Members of Congress who have presented these constructive amendments. But for reasons of their own, the administration has chosen to demand the extension of the program for 3 years without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." Certainly, almost anyone will agree that in 14 years of administration of any act, imperfections will be revealed, imperfections which will require the application of the amendatory process.

After 14 years painstaking study of the program we have become convinced that imperfections have been revealed which require the attention of the Congress. One of these imperfections which has been revealed in a flagrant way is to be found in the operations of the Committee on Reciprocity Information, which is the committee which, under the President's Executive order, is charged with the responsibility of conducting public hearings upon a contemplated trade agreement which is about to be negotiated. The Committee on Reciprocity Information is a nonscientific, nontechnical, nonexpert body composed of representatives of various executive agencies of the Government. In the performance of this function this Committee on Reciprocity Information has never had a permanent personnel. At hearings conducted on the trade agreements program different faces have successively appeared, only to serve temporarily, and, according to rumors supported substantially by statements of those who know whereof they speak, that committee has never done anything other than to exhibit itself, sit at the bench, look wise, and listen to expressions, or pretend to, from representatives of American business, agriculture, industry, and labor.

So far as is known, the testimony taken before that committee has never been written up. In my personal experience, under permission to revise and extend the remarks made before that committee, I have never been able to get my hands upon a stenographic transcript of my testimony. Repeated requests have always met with the same answer: "It has not been transcribed as yet."

Former members of this strange aggregation who have served as members of this committee, members who are now in retirement from public service, have assured me that they were never under any direction other than to appear at the hearings and to sit upon the bench; that they were never asked for any advice; that they never gave any advice; that they were never asked to offer any recommendations, not even to prepare a report. I think that such a procedure is a cruel travesty, a sad commentary upon the whole program. It is a cruelty inflicted upon every conscientious American businessman, every representative of labor, every representative of agriculture who has laid aside his personal pursuits and journeyed to Washington to present the case for his principal in the belief that that which he would have to say would receive the sympathetic consideration of a competent and responsible official of his Government, this in the hope that he might win by his presentation some concessions for the industry whose case he pleaded.

So, what did the Ways and Means Committee do to correct this pious fraud? Regarding the Committee on Reciprocity Information's irresponsibility as an imperfection in the program, we merely suggest in this bill that for the irresponsible Committee on Reciprocity Information, an impartial, nonpartisan, independent, scientific, technical organization of experts known as the Tariff Commission be substituted.

The United States Tariff Commission has the confidence of the American people. Regardless of party, regardless of political philosophy, during the years of its existence the Tariff Commission has been praised by everyone who knows anything about its operations as an organization that knows what it is doing; that it performs its functions in a thoroughly disinterested and purely professional way. So, is it not better, is it not an improvement, to offer the Tariff Commission as a substitute for this now thoroughly discredited Committee on Reciprocity Information? It is a constructive amendment which the American people will accept when they understand it and observe its operation with enthusiastic approval; of this I am most certain. When orators paint the wonderful word picture of the success of this program, real and imaginary, let me point out, as the iconoclast that I am, that there are many people who have raised their voices in bitter criticism of the trade-agreements program and its administration. There are certain American industries that have been very seriously injured in the carrying on of their businesses, the promotion of agriculture, and the protection of labor's right to work.

Some industries which were once very important in the American scheme of things, because of the unwise tariff treatment, are today practically nonexistent, this insofar as the business they were carrying on when the trade-agreements program was enacted is concerned.

I call your attention to the jewel-watch industry in the United States. There were in 1934 22 great jewel-watch manufacturers in the United States who were in that day supplying the American market with 79 percent of its requirements. Today, there are only three American jewel-watch manufacturers left, and they are supplying the American market with only 7 percent of the jewel watches that

this country requires. That is what can happen to an American industry that is not so fortunate as to employ the favor of those who make these agreements.

I might go on and tell you the story of wool and the story of chinaware and the story of glassware, shoes, and pottery; stories of innumerable American industries which have substantially suffered as a consequence of the blind slashing of the tariffs, the acceleration of imports which followed.

Because of this oft-demonstrated lack of understanding of their job, the certain consequences of their blind slashing of tariff walls those people who are being injured because of unwise treatement of the tariff affecting their respective industries should have the protection of a scientific body, a technical body of experts, experts who can comprehend what figures reflect and what statistics mean; scientists who can define a realm of safety in which they can operate their businesses with a reasonable sense of security.

So, we are suggesting that the Tariff Commission shall not only conduct public hearings and listen attentively and sympathetically to the American people as they present their respective cases but that, after it has completed its public hearings, it shall go on and make a technical study of the various problems presented in the light of the evidence taken at those hearings, including the technical testimony of the experts, both those of the Commission's staff and those who appear to testify in behalf of private industry, agriculture, and American labor. It is not only an economic balance of imports and exports which we all are seeking, but a deeper concern for the national defense of our country which we would promote. Any further blind cuts in tariffs which would depress, perhaps destroy, such strategic industries as the wool industry, must be prevented lest our country, as the Bard of Avon recites, be left naked unto its enemies. Without an accessible supply of wool, a third world war would find us helpless in a conflict of long duration. A subsidy for our wool-growers in the place of a tariff may save the wool-growers from financial destruction but not serve the cause of national defense; neither will the shifting of tariff duties from the shoulders of importers to those of the taxpayers help out in the long run. That is another consequence which the Tariff Commission would consider.

People say that we have become a Nation of such high tariff laws that all the rest of the world is worried about it. Just let me give you some figures to prove how untrue that is. The United Kingdom, which is composed of England, Scotland, Northern Ireland, and Wales, collects $3,164,000,000 from its customs; and when you consider that collosal figure bear in mind that England has only one-third of the population of the United States. The United States, a country with three times the population of England, collects only $494,000,000 from customs. In England they collect in customs $64.16 per capita. In the United States, in this country which is supposed to have prohibitive tariffs, we collect only $3.41 per capita. This simple recitation ought to be very illuminating to the American people when they consider whether or not the State Department, acting in the name of the President, has been technical, and scientific in the slashing of the tariffs during the course of the 14 years of administration of the Trade Agreements Act.

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

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, this bill is not a bill containing crippling amendments. Whenever the proponents of extension, without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," attack the bill on that ground you can rest assured that they have no reasons which they can cite why the bill is bad. If there were any sound reasons why this bill should not be enacted they would be cited, argued over and over again, and the smear word "crippling" would never be uttered. Because there is no real reason why the bill is bad, all we hear from the critics of the measure is that it is a crippling amendment which, if adopted, will, in some way, render the enforcement of the Trade Agreements Act impossible. So I inquire, Mr. Chairman, whom and how would it cripple? Would it cripple the program to substitute scientific tariff making for nonexpert bungling? Would it cripple the program to substitute business considerations for diplomatic trades? Why all the secrecy? Is it not time for someone to point out what is crippling about the Gearhart bill?

Everybody has confidence in the Tariff Commission; very few people who know anything about it have any confidence at all in the Committee for Reciprocity Information. So in substituting the Tariff Commission, an independent, impartial, nonpartisan agency trusted by everybody of all political persuasions, we are substituting a commission which will bring great prestige to our international trade negotiations, a prestige which it has conspicuously lacked in the days gone by. This commission then has an additional responsibility to perform under the bill and that is to fix the field in which the President can safely negotiate, a ceiling, so to speak, over which he cannot raise the tariff without injury to domestic economy or impairing the national defense, and a floor below which he cannot slash a tariff schedule without endangering domestic economy or impairing the national defense. Within that range the President will have a large, wide latitude in which to negotiate and conclude agreements.

If, however, the President believes the Tariff Commission is wrong, and he desires to fix a tariff schedule in an agreement above or below the limits fixed by the Tariff Commission he may still do so. He is free to disregard the Tariff Commission's recommendations if he wants to. But if he does, then it becomes the duty of the Congress to decide whether the President is right or the Tariff Commission, our legislative right arm, is right. It will make that decision by following the procedure of the reorganization act that has worked so well since its adoption several years ago.

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

Mr. GEARHART. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MICHENER. At the risk of repetition but because it is very important to some of us here, will the gentleman state briefly just what the Committee on Reciprocity Information is, who constitutes it, how it is set up, how it operates, and to whom it reports. This bill substitutes the Tariff Commission for this committee. We all know what the tariff is.

Mr. GEARHART. The Trade Agreements Act does not set up very much in detail. It merely says that whenever the President believes he can expand American opportunities in foreign markets he shall have the right to enter into trade agreements to achieve that objective, and in the pursuit thereof may grant corresponding concessions in the American market, all this for the purpose of improving our national trade relations. That is practically all the act lays down. There are lots of other limitations in the Trade Agreements Act that are not so important. So it became necessary for the President to issue an Executive order setting up the machinery for the consummation of these agreements. He did, under Executive order, set up a negotiating committee called the Trade Agreements Committee. It has various subcommittees, for instance a Committee on Countries, a Committee on Items, a Committee on Rates; many subcommittees of that kind. Though I cannot call attention to it with any enthusiasm, the Executive order also sets up another committee, one called the Committee on Reciprocity Information, which is charged with the duty of holding public hearings and listening to such complaints or criticisms as the American people desire to present. This committee, in my estimation, is nothing more nor less than a Punch and Judy show. It makes no report, it offers no recommendations, it is not consulted by any other Trade Agreements Agency, least of all the agreement negotiators. The Committee on Trade Agreements, with a gay abandon and complete disregard of the Committee on Reciprocity Information, proceeds to its negotiations with foreign powers as if the CRI did not exist, eventually working out its trade agreements in its own nontechnical, nonscientific, diplomatic way.

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

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Michigan asked who were on this committee.

Mr. GEARHART. The Committee on Reciprocity Information?

Mr. KNUTSON. A representative of the State Department, a representative of the Department of Agriculture and several others.

Mr. GEARHART. Representatives of the Departments of State, Commerce,

Treasury, Agriculture, and one representative of the Tariff Commission but those members are not permanent in nature. There is no continuity of service. New faces appear at every succeeding hearing. There is no use pretending otherwise—this committee is just so much window dressing, nothing more. Their very existence, their petty pretensions are a continuing insult to the intelligence of the American people. The transfer of their theoretical functions to the practical, scientific worded Tariff Commission is the best feature of the Gearhart bill. Mr. Chairman, I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I listened with much interest to the address delivered by my good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], chairman of the subcommittee, regarding the bill that is now before us for consideration. I have, of course, profound respect for his opinion and his views, but I regret that I am not in accord with his conclusions or his views touching this most important matter. I would not mislead anyone under any circumstances, but the truth is that I try not to be an extremist on any subject or on any occasion, especially on the subject of reciprocity. The gentleman from California has alleged again and again that some of us are so extreme that we would not concede anything, or would not agree to any compromise that we would not change the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." I believe the present reciprocal trade program has justified itself, and that it is the most practical, feasible, and successful method that has ever been devised for dealing with tariffs and foreign trade. However, I realize that we are in the minority, and if we cannot get what we want, we will be glad to take less if it is something that we can take, but we do not want to be told that we must take stone when what we ask for is bread.

Now, I believe that the title of this bill is a misnomer, and I think if the first three letters were eliminated from the title it would be an appropriate title. The title reads, "To extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes." If it would read "To end the authority of the President under section 350," and so forth, why I think it would be more accurate. But as presently stated, I think it is a misleading title, because I think the practical effect of it will be the death knell of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I have respect for the Tariff Commission, but I should like to ask somebody to tell me under the old method what weight and consideration was given to the Tariff Commission when the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act was written. It was just as much in existence then as it is now. It advised the Congress and the party in power and the country to write a different tariff bill than the Smoot-Hawley bill, and why were its views not followed then? I do not understand why they were not.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to my friend the distinguished chairman of our committee. He is one of my best friends. I cannot always agree with him about everything, but the gentleman always interests me, although he may not convince me.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is always both edifying and informative, but he is also quite partisan at times. Will the gentleman tell the House why his party has not lived up to the promise they made in 1932 to repeal the Hawley-Smoot Act? You have had 16 years to do it in. Now, why have you not done it? Tell the country why.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Why has not the gentleman's party kept all the promises it has ever made in its platforms?

Mr. KNUTSON. I was asking the gentleman to tell the country why you have not lived up to your promise to repeal the Smoot-Hawley Act.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We adopted a better method—the reciprocal-trade program. We learn something from experience, but the gentleman and his party never seems to forget anything. The gentleman is a devoted apostle of protection.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thank the gentleman for that fine compliment.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman and those who think like him have been complaining and charging in other years that the reciprocal-trade agreements program did repeal the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, we do not have time to debate the merits of this bill. The time is too short. They would not give us time to consider it in committee and now we do not have time to properly discuss it on the floor and do not have an opportunity to offer amendments. They say it is just a question of the extension of the present law. I want to say to you that if you had brought this in under an open rule, some Members from your own side might have offered some convincing, constructive, remedial, and helpful amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I introduced the first bill and opened the debate on the original Trade Agreements Act in 1934. This is the fifth time I have taken the floor on the extension of this act. Being a member of the minority at this time does not lessen my concern for the reciprocal trade program.

I regret that I am unable to give my support to the pending bill for the reasons that I shall try to state as briefly as possible.

The author of this bill has been opposed to the reciprocal trade-agreements program since its inception in 1934. In fact, not once in 1934, 1937, 1940, 1943, or 1945, if I am not mistaken, has any of the six ranking majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means voted for it.

For the gentleman from California, therefore, to sponsor a bill to extend the reciprocal trade program is like an unbeliever trying to revise the Bible. The opponents of the present law fear adverse public reaction if they kill the Trade Agreements Act with a single electric shock by refusing to extend it in any form. They have found it expedient to accomplish the same result with an overdose of chloroform.

The question before the House, as I see it, is twofold: Whether the Congress desires to continue in effect a policy which has been the keystone of our foreign economic relation for the past 14 years and which has proven itself as a fair, flexible, and feasible and successful method of dealing with tariff problems; or whether it will substitute the bill now under consideration which, in my opinion, would sabotage and nullify the trade agreements program.

I. PURPOSES OF RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM

On March 2, 1934, President Roosevelt sent to the Congress a request for authority to enter into executive commercial agreements with foreign nations. He referred to the startling decline in the world trade which had meant "idle hands, still machines, ships tied to their docks, despairing farm households and hungry industrial families. It has made infinitely more difficult the planning for economic readjustment in which the Government is now engaged." Much of the responsibility for the decline in the foreign trade of the United States was attributable to the almost insurmountable tariff barriers in the Hawley-Smoot tariff Act of 1930 and its counterpart, or retaliatory tariffs by foreign countries.

Congress responded promptly to the President's request for early action by sending to him on June 7, 1934, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, giving him the authority to enter into foreign trade agreements "for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States, as a means of assisting in the present emergency and restoring the American standard of living, and overcoming domestic unemployment, and the present economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public, and in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce."

II. ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM

Prior to October 30, 1947, mutually beneficial trade agreements had been concluded between the United States and 29 foreign countries. We find that before World War II and its dislocation of world trade, the trade-agreements program had made important strides toward the expansion of our foreign trade with trade-agreement countries. The annual averages for the 2 years 1938–39, as compared with the 2 years 1934–35, indicate that United States exports to trade-agreement countries increased 63 percent as against an increase of only 32 percent to nonagreement countries. United States imports increased 27 percent from agreement countries, as against an increase of only 12½ percent in imports from nonagreement countries. Total United States foreign trade aver-

aged 30 percent higher in the latter period than in the former.

The recent report of the United States Tariff Commission on the operation of the trade-agreements program also lends support to this conclusion. In terms of annual dutiable imports for all of the principal agreement countries, except Cuba, the average was 85 percent greater in 1937–38 than in 1932 to 1934. The increase for all other countries was 78 percent. With respect to United States exports, the Tariff Commission data show that the increase for the principal trade-agreement countries was materially greater than that for nonagreement countries—93 percent as compared with 71 percent. I maintain, therefore, that the Reciprocal Trade Act played a major part in our prewar economic recovery. It is also significant that we did not go to war against a single nation with which a trade agreement had been concluded. Although domestic unemployment and economic depression are not now problems, we must recognize the long-range dependence of the United States on foreign markets. We normally export dried fruits, wheat, leather, cotton, tobacco, industrial machinery, automobiles, and many other products of a mass-production economy. Of course, other countries can continue to buy only if they can sell to us products that we need. The avenue of foreign trade must be a two-way street.

The President, therefore, is on firm ground in saying that "the importance of the act is greater today than it has ever been." Certainly it would be foolish to lend our assistance to rebuilding the war-torn countries, only to nullify our efforts by erecting and maintaining barriers to world trade. The United States must continue its leadership in world economic affairs through effective exercise of the reciprocal trade authority, if it is to do so at all.

III. PROCEDURES UNDER PRESENT LAW AND UNDER H. R. 6556 COMPARED

The bill under consideration purports to extend the reciprocal trade authority of the President for 1 year. In reality, this authority would be meaningless, for lack of time if for no other reason. The basic policy and procedure of the program would be drastically changed.

The present law emphasizes broad national purposes in the expansion of our foreign trade. American producers are protected, however, by insertion of an escape clause in trade agreements under which the United States is free to withdraw a concession if it results in causing or threatening serious injury to any domestic business or industry. This policy would be abandoned in the present bill for one that fails to recognize the practical impossibility of determining in advance of actual experience the minimum rate of tariff required in every instance to prevent dislocation of American industry. Under the Gearhart bill, therefore, the broad national interest is subordinated to the maintenance of an advance guaranty to a few domestic producers. Much as I should deplore to see the present reciprocal trade program ended, this would be better, in my opinion, than to accept for only 1 year a counterfeit and sham that cannot work. I shall briefly compare the present law with the pending bill:

First. Under existing law, an interdepartmental committee on trade agreements acts as the agency through which the President seeks information and advice before negotiating a trade agreement. The over-all interest of American industry, labor, and farmers, and American military, financial and foreign policy are represented on the Trade Agreements Committee by a member of the Tariff Commission and by persons designated by the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War, Navy, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. The information and advice submitted to the Trade Agreements Committee are derived from three principal sources:

(a) Interested persons, including of course domestic producers, may either submit statements or briefs or appear at public hearings.

(b) The Tariff Commission makes a study of the imports and the effect of possible concessions.

(c) The Department of Commerce makes a similar study with respect to each export item, which considered for inclusion in a trade agreement. The Trade Agreements Committee then makes its recommendations to the President, who makes the final decision respecting the items included for negotiation and the extent of concessions to be offered. If any member of the Trade Agreements Committee dissents, the President is provided with a full report giving the reasons for the dissent.

The foregoing procedure provides an adequate opportunity for all interested parties to be heard before a trade agreement is negotiated. I heard of no complaint in the volumes of hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means, that interested parties have been denied courteous and impartial treatment. The interest of specific producers is balanced against and considered along with the over-all interest first of the general public, then of industry, labor, and agriculture and our military, financial, and foreign policies.

Under the pending bill however, primary consideration is given to a small segment of domestic producers. No foreign trade agreement could be entered into until the Tariff Commission reports to the President its findings as to the so-called peril-point below which tariffs may not be cut on any article; the extent to which additional tariffs may be imposed; or the maximum periods for which a tariff rate on an article may be bound at existing rates or on the free list.

Second. The Tariff Commission under the pending bill would not consider the benefit to domestic procedures from any possible concessions from foreign countries. The procedure is suggestive of horse-swapping without seeing the other fellow's horse. In addition to the one-sided emphasis in favor of a few domestic producers and against the over-all national self-interest, the proposed procedure raises the following procedural questions, which I call upon my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to answer:

(a) Does the Tariff Commission, as now constituted, have a sufficiently large number of qualified personnel to undertake the responsibilities which would be imposed by H. R. 6556? According to the most recent annual report of the Tariff Commission, "a larger staff is essential if the Commission is to continue to fulfill adequately and promptly the duties already laid upon it by existing law."

(b) How long would it take the Tariff Commission, as now constituted, to conduct public hearings, make the findings required by section 2 of H. R. 6556, and report to the President on the average number of articles contained in a bilateral trade agreement—or in a multilateral agreement like the one recently negotiated at Geneva?

(c) What would happen in the event the Tariff Commission, composed of six members—three Democrats and three Republicans—was equally divided, or had three or more minority views, respecting the findings required by section 2 of the bill? Or for some reason or other was unable to make such findings? The Chairman of the Tariff Commission, in response to my inquiry, gave me his personal views and offhand interpretation "that if the Commission should divide three to three on an article, no concession could be made on that article, whatever power the President might hold regarding it. The same result apparently would occur if three Commissioners held one view and each of the other three Commissioners held views differing from the three and differing from each other, or if for any other reason the Commission was not able to make a finding."

(d) Does the bill contemplate that the Tariff Commission would be required under H. R. 6556 to conduct extensive costs of production studies, not only of domestic but foreign producers as well?

I have raised these obvious questions in order to point out how utterly impossible it is that any new trade agreements could be negotiated within the 1-year extension so grudgingly granted by H. R. 6556.

The proponents have the burden of answering those questions in order for the Congress, the people of the United States, and representatives of foreign nations to accept this legislation in lieu of the present law.

Mr. Chairman, the letter dated May 17, 1948, from Hon. Oscar B. Ryder, Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, which I will insert in the RECORD, indicates very clearly, in my opinion, the doubts, complexities, confusion, and delay that would beset and stifle the reciprocal-trade program if the pending legislation were enacted.

Third. If the President enters into a trade agreement which goes beyond the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, he would be required to transmit such an agreement to the Congress for veto within a 60-day period by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses. If Congress is not in session, then approval will have to wait. The Commit-

tee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance would have the job of considering not only the tariff rates upon the article in disagreement between the President and the Tariff Commission, but also the rates upon all other articles included in the trade agreement. All of the domestic producers of all of the articles upon which reduction in tariff rates are made in a trade agreement would descend upon the Congress like the swarms of the tariff lobbies of 1930.

Fourth. Under the pending bill, no member of the Tariff Commission or of its staff could assist in the actual negotiation of a trade agreement, which would deprive the President of assistance of competent, trusted officers in negotiating the best bargain for the United States. Likewise, placing upon the Tariff Commission the sole responsibility for determining limits below which a cut may not be made without threatening injury to a domestic producers, or impairing the national defense, deprives other Government agencies of the opportunity to exercise the influence which their responsibilities and knowledge of the subjects would seem to justify. The Tariff Commission's judgment, for example, should not be preeminent in the field of agriculture over that of the Department of Agriculture or in the field of national defense over that of the Military Establishment.

Fifth. Perhaps as much as any other provision, section 5 of H. R. 6556 suggests a basic change in policy. Under existing law no tariff rate may be increased or decreased under a trade agreement by more than 50 percent of any rate of duty existing on January 1, 1945, but this bill would authorize the increase of any rate of duty by as much as 50 percent of any rate existing on June 12, 1934, which seems an authorization to increase Smoot-Hawley rates, the highest in history, by 50 percent. This seems to be a definite return toward Smoot-Hawleyism and the stagnation of trade and commerce.

IV. STRONG PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 335 FOR EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT FOR 3 YEARS WITHOUT AMENDMENT

Whatever this Congress may do, it is demonstrably clear that the overwhelming desire of the American people is to continue unimpaired the reciprocal trade program. They seem to appreciate and understand—

First. Secretary of State Marshall's warning that "any serious weakening of the Trade Agreements Act at this critical period in world affairs would almost certainly be regarded by other countries not only as a surrender of our leadership in the international economic field, but as a repudiation of much that has been accomplished under our leadership in that field."

Mr. Chairman, I shall read into the RECORD a letter dated May 21, 1948, addressed by me to the Secretary of State and the reply by the Secretary dated May 24, 1948, on the question whether the best interests of the Nation would be better served if the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act were permitted to expire than for H. R. 6556 to be enacted in its present form:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, State Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, H. R. 6556, which provides for an extension of the Trade Agreements Act for 1 year, makes drastic changes in the procedure for negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements.

In your opinion, in view of the scope of the proposed changes, would the best interests of the Nation be better served if the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act were permitted to expire than for H. R. 6556 to be enacted in its present form?

Your expeditious reply to this inquiry will be of great value to, and much appreciated by the minority Members in their consideration of the bill in the House of Representatives. It is now contemplated that the bill will be debated in the House on Wednesday, May 26, 1948.

With expressions of high esteem, I am
Sincerely yours,

R. L. DOUGHTON.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, May 24, 1948.

The Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: I have your letter of May 21 asking my opinion whether our national interests would be better served by permitting the expiration of the Trade Agreements Act than by the passage of H. R. 6556 with its drastic changes in procedure.

The trade agreements program has been a cornerstone of our foreign economic policy for 14 years. Through it we have exercised a significant part of our leadership in world economic affairs.

The principle of the trade agreements program is incorporated in the European Cooperation Act of 1948. The present Congress so provided because it recognized that European recovery waits upon a great expansion in European production for which there must be markets and that markets in turn wait upon a lowering of barriers to trade among the European countries and between such countries and other nations.

Although H. R. 6556 extends the Trade Agreements Act for 1 year, it does so with such crippling amendments that only a shadow of the original act is preserved while its substance is destroyed.

H. R. 6556 provides for a cumbersome procedure which would involve interminable delays and serious questions of responsibility.

It substitutes a single agency—Tariff Commission—for the present Trade Agreements Committee composed of representatives of seven Government agencies all directly interested in the tariff, as the body responsible for investigation and recommendation to the President.

Most serious of all it, in effect, makes pure protection the sole criterion for tariff action and forbids the Tariff Commission from participating in the deliberations of the Trade Agreements Committee, in which, under the present system, other important aspects of the national interest are also taken into account.

In my judgment enactment of H. R. 6556 would make the reciprocal trade agreements program unworkable.

Under the circumstances I think our national interests would be better served to permit the Trade Agreements Act to expire than for H. R. 6556 to be enacted. But it is my earnest hope that this Congress will extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 3 years without the proposed crippling amendments.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

Second. Secretary of Defense Forrestal's advice that renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act "is in the interest of our national security, both in the immediate and in the long-term sense." And the statement prepared by the Munitions Board that—

In war, the safety of the Nation is dependent on an industrial capacity, great enough in size and of the appropriate type, that can be mobilized quickly and effectively for the production of supplies and equipment needed by the armed forces. The trade agreement program places in the Nation's hands a flexible instrument which adds to the industrial capacity of the Nation through the development of foreign markets, and permits the strengthening of those industries which will be most needed if war should strike.

Third. The opinion of Under Secretary of Commerce Foster that renewal of the act is of great importance to the European recovery program and that—

The importance to the United States of maintaining a large volume of foreign trade will increase as time goes on. Many of our most valuable raw material resources are approaching exhaustion, and we will have to import more and more, if we are to maintain our industries in operation.

At present the United States has no problem in obtaining the purchasing power for the imports we need. But surely every country in the world, and this is particularly true of raw material producing countries, is determined to industrialize, both in order to reduce its dependence on manufactured imports and to obtain for itself all of the profits from the processing of its raw materials.

Unless we use our bargaining power to its fullest extent, we can expect a growing body of restrictions against our exports. The future strength and prosperity of the United States depend upon our ability to maintain a maximum flow of trade with the rest of the world, in both directions.

Fourth. The assurance of Secretary of Agriculture Brannan that his study of the effects of trade agreements from 1936 until the outbreak of Word War II "showed a consistent advantage to American agriculture. Our farm exports to the countries with which we had trade agreements fared better than did our farm exports to other countries; the items on which tariff reductions were made fared better than did others. The commodities which received benefits were typically those—such as wheat and other grains, lard and pork products, citrus fruits and apples, fresh vegetables, canned fruits, and nuts—which were at that time suffering from heavy domestic surpluses. On the import side there was also an increase, the agricultural commodities involved were chiefly those not produced in the United States or those imported in only small volume, insignificant in relation to our own production. Imports of items directly in competition with American agricultural products increased relatively little."

Fifth. The statement by Mr. James B. Carey, representing the Congress of Industrial Organizations, that—

One of the means of attaining our goal of full employment at a fair wage and full

production is through international trade encouraged by reciprocal trade agreements. The philosophy of the old Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act passed in 1930, at the beginning of the greatest depression we have ever had, was to protect American products by eliminating foreign competition. This was done by placing high tariffs on imports to keep them out of the country. This philosophy presupposes foreign competition adversely affects American production and employment and that we increase production and employment by restricting foreign markets. This is fallacious.

A sound economic foreign policy must seek to encourage high levels of production and employment. Maintaining foreign markets for our goods and importing vital materials necessary for our industrial production will play an essential part in keeping our industrial potential operating at full employment and full production levels.

Sixth. The recommendation of Mr. Charles P. Taft, vice chairman of the citizens' committee for reciprocal world trade that—

Congress should certainly renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without change. Nothing could damage our interests more than a crippling of this policy as we put the Marshall plan into effect, which calls for just the principles of trade established under this act.

Seventh. The viewpoint of Mr. Earl O. Shreve, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, that—

From the point of view of practical operation, I cannot see advantage in changing the present basic legislation in such ways as would restrict the flexibility of administrative procedure which has characterized the program since its inception.

Congress in renewing the legislation for 3 years should oppose any amendment to the act which will nullify the advantages in the present system of negotiation and administration.

Eighth. The warning of Mr. John Abbink, representing the National Foreign Trade Council "that other nations are waiting only for a signal from the United States to embark on nationalistic programs which would make trade barriers of the thirties seem inconsequential."

Ninth. The appeal for a 3-year extension made by Mr. Morris Rosenthal, president, National Council of American Importers, as "an essential part of a bipartisan American foreign policy."

Tenth. The reminder by Mr. H. J. Heinz II, chairman, United States Associates of the International Chamber of Commerce that—

Negotiation of trade agreements is a lengthy process. As a practical measure, it would be extremely difficult to either negotiate new agreements or renegotiate old agreements if the present reciprocal trade program is extended for a period shorter than 3 years.

Eleventh. The opinion of Dr. Mildred Northrup, Bryn Mawr professor of economics, that—

The method of tariff negotiation is one of the aspects of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which is most often the subject of attack. And it is the method of arriving at tariff agreements that I as an economist—a social scientist—find peculiarly satisfactory in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The tariff has been removed as a plaything of special interest groups and placed upon a scientific basis of specific rate determination. After full and open hearings possible tariff concessions are determined and each concession is judged, as it should be, in terms of the general welfare of the whole economy.

In this procedure, there is no room for special pressures—for special interests that will not stand up to an economic judgment rendered in terms of the economic prosperity for the whole country rather than for a privileged few.

Many other statements in support were made either in testimony before the Ways and Means Subcommittee or in documents filed for the RECORD.

That the foregoing quotations are not the utterances of a highly-paid well-organized lobby is shown by the most recent Gallup poll which reports that 80 percent of informed people favor continuation of trade agreements, as against 8 percent of such persons who oppose such agreements.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD the following Gallup poll reported in the Washington Post of May 13, 1948:

OPINION OF INFORMED VOTERS IS 4 TO 1 FOR TRADE TREATIES

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., May 12.—President Truman's request for renewal of the Trade Agreements Act is overwhelmingly approved by voters informed about the purpose of reciprocal trade treaties. People who know about the treaties vote better than eight to one to retain them.

But it may come as a shock to educators and national leaders to realize that, after 14 years of debate over Cordell Hull's trade treaty program, the vast majority of voters—two out of three—do not know what "reciprocal trade treaties" are.

Since the whole question of tariff rates is complicated, the institute used its method of question design which makes it possible to analyze every facet of opinion and to sort out the views of the informed and uninformed voters.

Of the representative voters surveyed, 34 percent said they know what reciprocal trade treaties are. While relatively few could give exact definitions, most grasped the general idea that such pacts give signatory countries mutual trade concessions. Under the Trade Agreements Act, Congress granted the President power to work out agreements with other countries to adjust tariff rates on individual items on a reciprocal give-and-take basis.

To those knowing about the treaties, field reporters for the institute put this question:

Some people say that because the United States is planning to spend $6,000,000,000 in the next year on the Marshall plan it is no longer necessary to continue reciprocal trade agreements. Other people say that the Marshall plan makes the need for trade agreements greater than ever. Do you think the trade agreements should or should not be continued?

The answers:

	Percent
Should be continued	80
Should not be continued	8
No opinion	12

To test the intensity of voters' views, the institute asked, How strongly do you feel about this—very strongly, fairly strongly, or not at all strongly? Half of those favoring retention said they felt very strongly, slightly less than half, fairly strongly; and less than 1 in 10 not strongly at all.

No major differences between Republican and Democratic voters arise in regard to continuation of the treaties. Eight out of 10 in each party support the treaties, and the same proportion exists among voters who call themselves independent of any party allegiance.

A House of Representatives committee has held hearings on a bill to extend the trade act for 3 years beyond next month's expiration date. Originally passed in 1934, the act has been renewed by several Congresses since then. An institute poll in 1945, when the act was last extended, showed 75 percent of the informed voters favoring renewal at that time.

Supporters of the legislation point out that the European Cooperation Act calls for participating countries to sign treaties with the United States to reduce trade barriers among themselves and other countries.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I want it clearly understood that I am not a free trader. I do not want a tariff so low as to throttle or prevent the growth and expansion of legitimate industry, nor one so high as to stifle competition and to breed, nourish, and shelter monopoly. In my opinion, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, notwithstanding the disruptions of the war years, has demonstrated its effectiveness. I am convinced that it is the most feasible, satisfactory and practical way of handling the foreign trade problem. The present law is such an improvement over the old log-rolling, back-slapping, monopoly-breeding, enemy-making method of dealing with the tariff. The 1-year extension would be nullified by red tape which would make it impossible to negotiate any new agreements within that limit. The majority apparently desire to kill the program without assuming responsibility for its death.

My final appeal, in the words of the esteemed and revered elder statesman, Hon. Cordell Hull, is:

Today our Nation and all nations need more than ever before to cooperate wholeheartedly in establishing, in as large an area of the world as possible, the conditions of political liberty, economic progress, and enduring peace.

The attainment of these conditions of civilized life especially requires that the peoples of the world have an opportunity to trade with one another to their mutual benefit and with a minimum of stultifying restrictions. The trade agreements program provides the most effective framework for the realization of that opportunity. The continued existence of the program is indispensable if our Nation and all nations are to look confidently to a brighter future.

Under leave already granted, I insert the following letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, May 17, 1948.

The Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: I have your letter of May 14 asking that I give you my personal views on certain questions which you ask regarding H. R. 6556.

This bill would alter existing procedures in the negotiation of trade agreements by vesting in the Tariff Commission statutory responsibility for investigating and reporting to the President regarding what modifications could be made in duties on imported articles without causing or threatening to cause serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, or impairing the national defense. For this purpose the Commission would be required to hold

hearings and afford reasonable opportunity for persons interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

Because of your desire for a prompt response to your questions, I shall not have an opportunity to give them lengthy consideration or to discuss them in advance with my colleagues on the Commission. I am, therefore, giving you only my offhand personal views. Your questions and my answers to them are as follows:

"1. Does the Tariff Commission as now constituted have a sufficiently large number of qualified personnel to undertake the responsibilities which would be imposed by H. R. 6556?"

The Commission's staff is highly qualified for the type of work in question, but at present totals only about 220. This staff is not adequate even for the present duties of the Commission. Should H. R. 6556 become law and should trade-agreement negotiations become active, additional staff would be required to meet the new responsibilities entailed by the act. How large an increase in staff would be needed would depend upon the interpretation given to section 2 of the bill. This section requires the Commission to make an investigation and report to the President regarding the concessions which may be made, without injury to domestic producers, on each of the articles which are listed for inclusion in the negotiations. It would be one thing if investigation by the Commission were to be limited, as it has been in connection with most articles covered by the trade agreements so far made, to assembling and analyzing the readily available information on the various articles. It would be quite another thing if section 2 should be construed to require special investigations with respect to all, or most of the articles included in the negotiations. Of course, an interpretation intermediate between these two extremes might be adopted, whereby such special investigations could be confined to a limited number of commodities as to which particularly difficult problems were present.

By the term "readily available information," I mean information already in the possession of the Commission, whether or not previously published, and such additional information as can readily be obtained from other Government agencies or from private sources, without special investigation. By "special investigation" I mean an inquiry of the type which involves field work or questionnaires, or both. I have in mind investigations of such scope as those the Commission conducts under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and as those which the Commission will make in cases arising under the escape clause in trade agreements.

"2. What would be the estimated period of time required to conduct public hearings, make the findings required by section 2 of H. R. 6556, and report to the President on the average number of articles contained in a bilateral trade agreement?"

Here again the answer is dependent upon whether extensive special investigations would be required under section 2 of the bill or whether the Commission could proceed, in general, on the basis of the analysis of readily available information. If the Commission could proceed on the basis of readily available information, it could with adequate staff probably conduct hearings and make its recommendations as to an average trade agreement in 4 to 6 months, assuming that the Commission were free to concentrate largely on trade-agreement work. If, however, special investigations should be required or if the Commission's work on trade agreements should be substantially interrupted by other assignments, then the time required would be longer. How much longer would depend upon the proportion of commodities as to which special investigations were deemed necessary.

"3. What would have been the estimated time for performing the same functions in respect of the articles upon which negotiations were recently conducted at the Geneva conference?"

The answer to this question hinges largely upon the same imponderables as the answer to the preceding question. Additional questions would, however, arise. For example, would it be necessary for the whole Commission to sit in the hearings or could the Commission be divided into panels, as was done by the Committee for Reciprocity Information in the hearings on the Geneva negotiations? If the Commission could divide into panels for the hearings, if it could proceed on the basis of readily available information, and if it could concentrate almost exclusively on the trade agreements, then the Commission might complete making recommendations under H. R. 6556 with respect to as many articles as were included in the Geneva negotiations in about a year. Unless all these conditions could be satisfied, however, it would take longer. If none of them were satisfied, as much as 2 years or more would probably be required, depending again on the proportion of commodities as to which special investigations were made.

"4. What would happen in the event (a) the Tariff Commission were equally divided or had three or more minority views respecting the findings required by section 2 of H. R. 6556, or (b) the Commission for some reason or other was unable to make such findings?"

My offhand interpretation of the bill is that if the Commission should divide 3 to 3 on an article, no concession could be made on that article, whatever view the President might hold regarding it. The same result apparently would occur if three Commissioners held one view and each of the other three Commissioners held views differing from the three and differing from each other, or if for any other reason the Commission was not able to make a finding.

This point is important in view of the fact that the Commission is composed of an even number of Commissioners (three Democrats and three Republicans). It is also important because of the nature of the findings required by section 2 of H. R. 6556. Even under normal conditions, it is difficult to predict with much assurance the effect of any given change in duty. Under the abnormal conditions now existing in the world, the difficulty is greatly intensified. All that the Commissioners could do would be to analyze all the available facts and arrive at judgments largely based on assumptions regarding various general factors such as the rate of rehabilitation of industries in war-torn countries, the course of price levels in the United States and foreign countries, and the movements of foreign exchange rates. The room for differences in opinion is obviously great and as the Commission is composed of six men whose tariff views are by no means uniform, their judgments on contentious items might very well differ, at least in degree. There are no objective methods by which such differences in judgment could be resolved.

"5. What would be the minimum increase in staff and appropriations required by the Tariff Commission in order to insure that the responsibilities imposed by H. R. 6556 with respect to the average number of dutiable articles considered in bilateral trade agreements could be fulfilled within 6 months after such list is submitted to the Tariff Commission?"

Again the answer must depend upon the factors mentioned in reply to questions 1, 2, and 3 above. If the Commission could proceed on the basis of readily available information and could virtually exclude other work while engaged in making investigations regarding trade agreements, then an increase in staff of about 50 percent might suffice. If, however, many special investigations were deemed necessary and if the Commission were obliged to do considerable work on other assignments, then a much larger increase would be required—as much as 100 percent or more.

6. In your opinion would the Commission be required under H. R. 6556 to conduct extensive cost of production studies? Would you have much confidence in these studies?

It is, of course, impossible for me to predict whether the Commission would decide under H. R. 6556 to make extensive cost of production studies. I should think, however, that it would decide against making such studies if only because of the additional time required. If, however, the Commission were to decide that extensive cost investigations were necessary, then the estimates made in response to questions 2, 3, and 5 would all have to be increased substantially.

Time is not available to state in any detail my views regarding differences in costs of production as a criterion for adjusting tariff rates. Suffice it to say that in my opinion cost studies are, as a practical matter, of somewhat limited usefulness in tariff making, not only because of the time required to make such studies, but also because of the character of the decisions which have to be made in resolving the complex questions which arise regarding the comparability of the domestic and imported products, the allocation of general and overhead costs to particular joint products or byproducts, the method of averaging costs of different producers, the appropriate markets to which to compute costs of transportation, and other matters. Such cost studies as are feasible, however, do supply valuable information regarding conditions of competition between domestic and foreign producers. Whether cost studies, by themselves, usually afford an adequate basis for determining the proper protective tariff rate may be doubted.

"7. Do you think the procedure established by H. R. 6556 would enable the Commission to render a better public service than it now performs?"

I can answer this question only by giving you my entirely personal views on the question of the proper functions for the Tariff Commission.

The Commission was established in 1916 in order that the Congress and the Executive might have a reliable source of objective information on tariff matters, information which could be accepted as authentic by all sides in any tariff controversy. Thus, from the very beginning its primary function has been to find the facts, leaving policy decisions to the Congress and the President. I doubt the advisability of transforming the Commission into a policy-making agency and thus subjecting it, more than in the past, to political vicissitudes.

My fear is that the attempt to determine the degree to which duties may be reduced without injury to domestic producers or impairment of the national defense would require the making of such difficult and fundamental judgments that the Commission would, in effect, be making major policy decisions. The element of judgment, of course, enters into the various phases of the Commission's present work. This is especially true of the duties which have been assigned to it under the escape clause in trade agreements. In cases under that clause, however, its findings as to whether serious injury to domestic producers has occurred or is threatened will be based upon actual observation of imports and domestic production after the trade agreement concession in question has come into force. In contrast the findings required under H. R. 6556 would have to be based to a large extent, especially under present abnormal conditions, on assumptions and estimates as to future probabilities.

"8. Are there any additional comments on H. R. 6556 that you would care to make?"

I have not had an opportunity to study the bill sufficiently to make further comments at this time. I can only hope that I have answered your other questions sufficiently. In any circumstance I want you and the other members of the Committee on Ways and Means to know that I and the other members of the Tariff Commission will always endeavor to the best of our ability to assist in carrying out any functions which the Congress shall assign to the Commission.

Respectfully yours,

OSCAR B. RYDER,
Chairman.

Now, I yield to my distinguished friend. He says this is a New Deal measure. I want to read to him what Governor Landon, the Republican candidate for President of the United States in 1936, says about it. He is not a New Dealer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes, in order to answer my friend.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman tell us for our information in what way the Gearhart bill would cripple the present program?

Mr. DOUGHTON. In every way. That is the best answer I can give. It would—I will not say cripple it—it will mortally and fatally wound it; that is what it will do, because it will be impractical and unworkable and through that method of indirection the very purpose of those opposed to the program will be accomplished.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes. I have here an article regarding the position of ex-Governor Landon on the pending bill. Alf Landon said the proposed revisions are contrary to the tariff plank of the 1944 Republican Convention.

Then he says something in which I agree with him, that the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, is the best qualified Republican for the Republican nomination. I agree with everything Mr. Landon says in that statement, absolutely.

Under leave already granted, I insert the Landon article at this point in the RECORD:

LANDON SUPPORTS RECIPROCITY LAW

Alf Landon, GOP standard bearer in 1936, yesterday assailed House Republican proposals for revision of the reciprocal trade law. Instead, he called for a 3-year extension of the act without changes, as requested by President Truman.

The proposed revisions, he said, are contrary to the tariff plank of the 1944 Republican Convention, as interpreted by Dewey, the Republican Presidential nominee that year.

The Kansan boosted House Speaker MARTIN, of Massachusetts, for the Republican Presidential nomination. "We couldn't do better than Joe," he said.

Reporters met Landon when he called at MARTIN'S office.

While discussing a wide range of subjects, the Kansan put greatest weight on the tariff issue.

"The Republican tariff bill," Landon said, "endangers the reciprocal trade program and endangers the whole policy of postwar economic reconstruction of the world. It threatens to waste the money we are advancing for foreign relief."

Take the columnists from the newspapers of the country. They unanimously support the present law and condemn the bill now before the House. Of the columnists not more than 1 in 20 are against the reciprocal trade agreement program.

Take the magazines of the country. The overwhelming preponderance of enlightened and intelligent judgment in this country is in favor of a continuance of the reciprocal trade law.

In my opinion, my humble, honest opinion—I may be wrong, but I doubt it—in my opinion if this Republican trade agreements program were the only issue between the Republicans and the Democrats in the next campaign the Republicans would not carry one State in the Union. That is my honest opinion because North and South, East and West, civic organizations, religious organizations, business organizations, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the CIO, the A. F. of L., all favor the present law and are opposed to the program that would be provided by this bill.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify my position on this legislation. We have been working for months to develop a program for the rehabilitation economically of 16 nations in Europe. The essence of that rehabilitation program, or one of the very important parts of it, was the breaking down of economic barriers between those nations so that their economy could begin to develop so far as practicable by the interchange of commodities and goods. I feel it would be a great calamity to our European enterprise, involving billions of the taxpayers' money and a great American business administration, if we announced to the world that while we are asking those conditions of a free economic exchange to be established in Europe and paying for having such an establishment of them, we should now enter upon an attempt to give up reciprocal trade agreements that have been in force for so many years. I recognize that this reciprocal trade legislation ends on the last day of this month. I believe it would be a great calamity to have it end then, and since the only legislation we have for its extension carries it forward only for 1 year I am anxious to have it carried forward for that length of time because I hope in that time we will again have one government here. While it may sound like a dream, I would not be surprised if it turned out to be entirely Republican, both here on the Hill and downtown. If that be so, then the one party in power will have to assume responsibility for continuing the reciprocal trade agreements or diminishing them or abandoning them altogether. For that reason I am going to vote for this extension of 1 year, which is all we can vote for.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word now on the subject of tariffs, about which I am in pretty nearly as deep ignorance as some of my colleagues. When the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill was before the House I made a very careful study of our foreign trade and found a few remarkable facts. First of all, Canada, with ten or eleven million people, was our best customer. Canada bought more from this country in 1 year than all of North and South America put together, including the West Indian Islands, more than any other nation in the world across the Atlantic or anywhere else. I inquired why, and I found the reason was that the Canadian level of wages approximated ours; so that there was a very broad diffusion of buying power among the Canadian people and that approximation in their level of wages reduced the competition against our own workers and made it possible for the Canadian people to be the largest purchasers of our output.

I studied Czechoslovakia also. They sent people over here to learn the shoe business, then went back and set up that business over there and were very successful. They paid a starvation wage, I think in some cases 30 cents a day. Czechoslovakia, with more people, or as many as Canada, just purchased a handful of commodities from the United States. The reason was the low level of their wages. They had no buying power among the masses of the people.

So I proposed, and it was somewhat of a serious thing for a man as badly equipped as I was on such matters to make the proposal, that we have a new kind of tariff, that we base our tariff upon the wage level or the buying power of other countries, and that where their wage level approximated ours we would have a low tariff, and where the wage level was on a starvation basis we would have a high tariff, and as their wage level rose and their buying power increased, and their competition against us diminished, we would reduce the tariff. I submitted that to all the tariff experts of both Houses and met with unanimous disapproval, which convinced me that for once in my life I was right. I now submit it to you for your future consideration when the tariff question comes up under a Republican administration.

I am going to vote for this legislation because I want reciprocal trade to continue until the Republicans come into legislative and executive power, at which time they will have the responsibility of disposing of it one way or the other.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, at the outset of my remarks, I wish to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the able gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], and the equally able Republican members of the Subcommittee on Reciprocal Trade, for the very fine job that they have done; a job that was long overdue and very necessary. I was a little bit amused and somewhat surprised, though not edified, by the remarks made by my good and dear friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. I have always known that he was adroit. I have always suspected that he

could work both sides of the street without violating any traffic regulations. He denounced the Smoot-Hawley bill in no temperate language. Of course, he should be proficient in that line, for as far back as I can recall he has consistently held that view. He is against tariffs, but he does not say a word about being against embargoes. Oh, the gentleman from North Carolina is an embargoist.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, certainly.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I did not get to it in my speech; I did not have time to state my position on the tariff. I am not always against tariffs, and I am not always for embargoes. I am not a free-trader that would stifle small, struggling industries or prevent their growth or expansion. On the other hand, I am against a monopoly-breeding tariff that protects a few interests at the expense of all the people of the country. That is my position on the tariff.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am glad to have the gentleman's declaration of political faith, although I am sorry to say that it was hardly necessary. Let me ask, Has he ever protested against the embargo on the importation of short-staple cotton? We are told by the State Department that embargoes and excessively high tariffs not only breed ill-feeling among nations, but promote wars. Has the gentleman in his zeal to preserve peace ever protested against the embargo on cotton imports?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not know as I have.

Mr. KNUTSON. No; I did not think so.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not know as I ever favored it, either, and I do not know that it has been an issue with me, either.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course not.

Mr. DOUGHTON. They do not grow any long staple cotton in my district.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am talking about short staple cotton.

Mr. DOUGHTON. And I am not a fanatic one way or the other on any tariff so far as that is concerned.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman reminds me of the story of the housemaid. It seems that after she had worked for the family a while, the wife one day said to the husband, "What do you think of Mary, John? I hear that she isn't all that she should be." "Well," said John, "I will talk to her about it." So he did, and Mary very indignantly denied any improper conduct. "But," she said, "I'm not fanatical on the subject."

I think that is the position my friend from North Carolina is in. He is not fanatical on the subject of protection. It is so sweet to hear the faithful watchdog bay as we draw near home on election day. I think the gentleman had something to do with putting an embargo against the exportation of tobacco seed, and I compliment him on it. The gentleman shakes his head in denial. I cannot think of any other Democrat who would have the forethought to put an embargo on the exportation of burley tobacco seed. Far be it from me to question the propriety of what was done.

The gentleman read a letter from Secretary Marshall. As Chief of Staff, Marshall may have been quite a fellow: I do not know. They tell us that under his direction the war cost us three times as much as it should have, that there had never been a war fought by this country where there was more waste and inefficiency than in the late war. But probably Marshall was not responsible for it, although he was Chief of Staff.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. This General Marshall, of course, is the one who did not know where he was the night before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has he known where he has been since? He went to China to patch things up, and only made matters worse. If you do not believe me, ask the Chinese. Then he started to fix up the Palestine question and, like my good friend from North Carolina, he worked both sides of the street on that problem. One day he recommended partition and the next day he repudiated it. So the gentleman from North Carolina will have to excuse me if I refuse to accept General Marshall as an authority on the matter before us.

Mr. DOUGHTON. What about Governor Landon?

Mr. KNUTSON. They seduced him with a lot of attention since the New Deal came in. He is like other Americans I know, he has an ambition to sleep in the Abraham Lincoln bed at the White House. There is more than one way of leading one astray.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I assume the gentleman is still strongly opposed to the European recovery plan and to every suggestion that the State Department makes for international cooperation?

Mr. DINGELL. Answer the question "Yes" or "No."

Mr. KNUTSON. I suppose the gentleman wants either "Yes" or "No" for an answer.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman can answer it as he pleases.

Mr. KNUTSON. Our friend from Michigan thinks it can be answered in one word.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman can answer it as he pleases, and in his own time.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thank the gentleman for his generosity and the latitude he affords me. The Marshall plan for world-wide recovery is nothing but a glorified UNRRA. The only difference between the Marshall plan and UNRRA is that UNRRA cost us a little less than $3,000,000,000, while the Marshall plan will cost us in the neighborhood of eighteen or twenty billion dollars. However, the Marshall plan has the advantage that it will provide many more soft berths for the faithful. Have I answered the gentleman's question?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Faithful what?

Mr. KNUTSON. Faithful followers of the New Deal. I am sorry I have to lay it out in detail.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The man in charge of the ERP certainly is not a New Dealer. Paul Hoffman is a Republican, is he not? He is a faithful Republican.

Mr. KNUTSON. I did not know that he was.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And throughout the State Department there are many faithful Republicans.

Mr. KNUTSON. We have as many varieties of Republicans as you have Democrats—not quite as many varieties as there are of Heinz pickles, but we do have too many kinds. For instance, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is one variety of Democrat. My good friend from North Carolina is another brand of Democrat, and my good friend from Massachusetts is yet another brand. I would say he is the happy medium between the two extremes.

The gentleman from North Carolina read from Secretary Marshall's letter. Frankly, I did not get any information from the letter. I had no more information when he got through reading it than when he began. I want to read from another distinguished American whose reputation for having a broad grasp of foreign affairs is fully as great as that of Mr. Marshall. I refer to the able gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman HERTER, who did a splendid job in relief work under Herbert Hoover, a Republican.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. What variety of Republican is he?

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentlewoman please get recognition from the Chairman when she wishes to interrogate a speaker? That is the rule of the House.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Three minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot possibly yield with only 3 minutes remaining.

I quote from the New York Times of Thursday morning, where there appeared a synopsis of a very able speech by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], delivered the night before to the World Trade Association meeting in that city:

Congressmen HERTER, who, as vice chairman of the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid, headed a special delegation of Congress to Europe whose report played a major role in the legislation for the European recovery program, said:

"In my opinion, there is no need of fear on the part of those who favor the principles of the reciprocal trade agreements with respect to the new House proposals.

"In effect, three changes have been made in existing procedure. The first calls for studies and hearings on a given set of commodities to be made by the Tariff Commission instead of the Committee on Reciprocity Information, which is an interdepartmental committee. The views of every department of the Government can, of course, be given

to the Tariff Commission, but the Commission has been created as a bipartisan technical commission whose responsibility it is to give the kind of advice provided for in the new proposals. I do not feel too concerned over substitution of this body for an interdepartmental committee.

"The second change has to do with the submission of certain agreements to the Congress. The President is free to negotiate tariff changes within the brackets reported to him in secret by the Tariff Commission as being the upper and lower limits to which the Tariff Commission believes he can properly go without serious injury to American business.

"Should an agreement stay within these limits, then that agreement becomes effective immediately. Should the President go beyond the upper or lower limits set by the Tariff Commission, he is then required to submit the agreements to Congress together with the Tariff Commission report and his own reasons for having gone beyond the recommendations made to him. Congress then has the privilege by a concurrent resolution of both branches to negative the entire agreement provided it does so within 60 days. If it does not act at all within that period, the agreement then becomes effective."

Touching upon the proposed 1-year limitation, Representative HERTER described this as proper for the reason that a newly elected administration coming into office next January ought to have the right to make its own recommendations in the setting of a pattern for its term of office.

All should be in agreement with that statement.

The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has told you what the procedure would be under his bill. Frankly, I do not see how any group in this House could possibly improve on what the gentleman from California has brought in here.

It is deplorable that this blind partisanship should have arisen over such an important issue as this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, as I have said on other occasions when discussing this legislation, it is my conviction that in its far-reaching consequences to the happiness and welfare of the people of this country, it is the most important legislation in many respects that this Congress could consider.

In 1934, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was first passed. In the intervening period of 14 years, we have negotiated 51 trade agreements with 41 different countries. They have resulted in great benefit to the people of this country, and there has never been any evidence presented of any serious injury to any American industry or interest during all that period of time. The record shows that our foreign trade with trade-agreement countries has more than doubled that of our foreign trade with countries with which we did not have trade agreements.

The program has been successful during the most difficult period in all the world's history. The President of the United States on March 1 of this year, in a special message to the Congress, recommended the extension of this program for the customary period of 3 years. The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, promptly introduced a bill or resolution carrying forward that recommendation of the President. Although all the month of March and all the month of April passed, the Ways and Means Committee under Republican control gave no consideration to that subject. Then, during this month, they rushed in and, with 6 days of closed hearings before a subcommittee, called themselves, considering this vital and all-important question. But the fact remains that not 1 day, not 1 hour, of public hearings was devoted to the bill here presented for consideration of the House.

The fact of the matter is that the real practical effect, and I think the real purpose, of the pending bill is to kill the trade agreements program. In that connection I should like to invite attention to the statement contained in the letter from the Secretary of State to which the gentleman from North Carolina referred; but there was some confusion in the chamber at the time and there is a question as to whether Members caught the real significance of that statement in the Secretary's letter. Among other things Secretary Marshall stated:

In my judgment, enactment of H. R. 6556 would make the reciprocal trade agreements program unworkable. Under the circumstances I think our national interest would be better served to permit the Trade Agreements Act to expire than for H. R. 6556 to be enacted. but it is my earnest hope that this Congress will extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 3 years without the proposed crippling amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I should like especially to invite attention to what I consider one of the most important phases of this question presented today. Time will not permit a discussion of all the phases of this program that I should like to present on this occasion but I should like especially to emphasize the fact that right at this particular time the extension of this program in its present form for the customary period of time of 3 years is more important than it has ever been before. We know that under the European Recovery Program Act passed by this Congress during this session that these European countries to benefit under that program must carry on reciprocal trade relations between themselves and with other countries of the world. I simply invite your attention to the language of the act itself. In the declaration of policy it is stated:

The accomplishment of these objectives calls for a plan of European recovery, open to all such nations which cooperate in such plan, based upon a strong production effort, the expansion of foreign trade, the creation and maintenance of internal financial stability, and the development of economic cooperation, including all possible steps to establish and maintain equitable rates of exchange and to bring about the progressive elimination of trade barriers.

Then on page 17 in the body of the act itself this language is to be found under section 115 with the heading "Bilateral and Multilateral Undertakings":

Such agreement shall provide for the adherence of such country to the purposes of this title, and shall, where applicable, make appropriate provision among others for—

And then subsection (3)—

Cooperating with other participating countries in facilitating and stimulating an increasing interchange of goods and services among the participating countries and with other countries and cooperating to reduce barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries.

So in effect we provide by law here that these countries participating in the European recovery program shall carry forward this type of reciprocal trade. For us to hesitate in extending our program to make it possible for us to continue the type of leadership that has brought us to the place we occupy today would be a serious mistake.

In this connection I invite your attention to the following statement made by the Secretary of State when he appeared before the subcommittee which handled this bill.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is part of the statement of the Secretary of State:

The statute establishing the ERP provides that bilateral agreements shall be made with the participating nations. The statute states as one of the prime conditions that the participating nations must agree to cooperate in facilitating and stimulating the interchange of goods among themselves and between themselves and other nations, and must cooperate to reduce barriers to trade among themselves and between themselves and other nations. In effect, we require these 16 nations to enter into reciprocal-trade agreements among themselves and between themselves and other nations. This is a wise provision because the recovery of Europe depends upon a great increase in the production of goods; and markets for these goods wait upon a lowering of barriers to the exchange of such goods.

The ERP was a vital step; but only a first step. We must now follow through with measures to make ourselves and the other free nations stronger. We must work closer together in commerce. No economic bond is closer than the friendly ties of mutually satisfactory trade. No force is more devisive than the introduction or maintenance of unnecessary barriers to such trade.

I submit, this being such a vital and important part of the foreign policy of this Government, and constituting the very foundation of our foreign economic policy, it would be a serious mistake for us to not at this time follow the customary procedure and extend the trade-agreements program in present form for the customary period of 3 years. There can be no doubt about the beneficial effects of this program up to now, but just at this critical point in the history of the world it is more important than ever before that we have this instrument to make it possible to trade with other countries of the world. You cannot always expect your neighbor to buy from you unless you sometimes buy something from him.

This program was provided for the purpose of expanding our foreign markets and making it possible for us to dispose of the vast surpluses we had of

industrial production and of agricultural products, in this country. With the enormous agricultural surpluses that we normally produce, unless we have markets at some other place in the world for the disposition of those surpluses, it could have only one effect and that is to hang over the American market as a threat and beat down the prices that our farmers receive for their products.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, the frantic plea for straight extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act indicated by the minority in the Ways and Means Committee report would be more impressive if it could not be traced to one or two central sources. The facts are, however, that the apparently spontaneous support is the synthetic product of a centrally directed control of organized pressure groups.

Within the Government, the drive for unrestricted power comes naturally from those who would wield it, the State Department and the Executive. They are not to be blamed for wanting all the power they can get; this is normal and was foreseen by the founding fathers who deliberately instituted a system of checks and balances in our governmental structure. Congress is performing a normal part of its functions when it checks this continual grabbing for unrestricted and unreviewable power by the Executive.

Outside the Government, the building up of support for Executive power in this instance comes from a group that has finally appeared under the name of the Citizens Committee for Reciprocal World Trade. The public-relations firm of Baldwin & Mermey, hired by this committee to organize the campaign, specializes in the setting up and the education of pressure groups. In its publications it insists that this is on behalf of noncommercial citizens or community groups. In effect, logrolling is fine as long as it is on the side of the internationalists.

In April 1947, this firm began the publication of a news letter called Resolved. The announcement gave the following information about Mr. Baldwin and the purpose of the news letter:

Mr. Baldwin states that "citizen organizations can become increasingly effective in their special fields if they are kept advised as to each other's policies, program techniques, and performance. The collective information in Resolved will have an impact on general public opinion that separate activities cannot hope to achieve. It is the belief of our firm that this flow of information can contribute to mutual understanding and cooperation between business and public-affairs agencies." * * *

Publication of Resolved has been undertaken by Baldwin & Mermey to fill a long-felt need for regular interchange of news among citizen organizations and to help advance better understanding and cooperation between these organizations and the business world from both of which this firm, as public-relations counsel, draws its clients.

The September 1947 issue of this news letter contained the following:

Citizen organizations are reexamining political-action techniques in light of record of Eightieth Congress. Letters and visits to Congressmen, testimony at committee hearings did not produce results they desired. Many large membership groups will shift focus to local precincts where members can influence grass-roots political machines. Headquarters representatives of citizen organizations are studying legislative strategy through joint action." * * *

Support for ITO Charter and Geneva trade agreements will get top priority in organizations' fall programs. Some 48 labor, farm, business, and citizen groups, including CIO Political Action Committee, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Foreign Trade Council, and American Veterans' Committee have declared their support for expanded world trade. Some specialized business associations favor protectionist policies.

Nine regional 2-day conferences, September 23 to October 29, will prepare representatives of local branches of the League of Women Voters of the United States to carry on fight for ITO and renewal of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Conferences in cities from New York to Los Angeles will dig into world trade facts and will stress community education techniques.

Some 2,000 communities will feel impact of world-trade advertising campaign this fall. Local drives will begin about November 1, 1947, will be led by international relations committee of United States Junior Chamber of Commerce (Akdar Building, Tulsa 3, Okla.). Advertising council will supply action manual, news releases, radio kit, campaign guide, proof sheets of ads, list of films, etc. Junior chambers will spark formation of committees of civic organizations to arrange with local advertisers for sponsorship of ads and to merchandise ads in group meetings.

Having as Mr. Baldwin says, both citizens organizations and business firms among its clients, the firm of Baldwin and Mermey is in an admirable position to obtain citizens organization backing for any of its programs. The firm has received a retainer of $21,000 to June 15, plus expenses, to muster support and lobby a flat 3-year extension through this Congress. In this connection, I would like to cite some business organizations the sponsors of this lobby are identified with. Some of the officers and members of this firm's Citizens Committee for Reciprocal World Trade come from International General Electric Co., International Business Machines Corp., Borg-Warner International Corp., International Telephone & Telegraph Co., International Petroleum Co. Ltd.

That will give you an idea of the private big business that is backing the Baldwin and Mermey Citizens Committee campaign. These firms can of course take care of themselves, moving their operations about the world as they choose. Small business, farmers, and American workingmen adversely affected by the program have no such facility.

Again, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I would be much more impressed with the display of support for simple extension of the act shown in the minority section of the Ways and Means Committee report on this bill if I were not confronted with the single origin of so much of it in the firm of Baldwin and Mermey, with its unidentified private business clients and advertised group of educated citizens organizations.

The export craze, which before the war supplied our enemies with almost unlimited amounts of war materials, is apparently to continue in spite of the lesson we learned. The large organizations which continually press for more exports find that we must take anything we can get in return to supply dollars to the foreign countries. In 1946, we imported well over 10,000,000 gallons of whisky and this amount was exceeded in 1947. This was not sufficient. Our exporters demanded more imports to pay for their exported products, so our obliging State Department again reduced the duty on liquors and where as we had an original duty of $5 per gallon, we now in 1948 have a duty of $1.50 per gallon. This was reduced in the hope that our imports of liquor would increase. Similar treatment was given to other spirituous liquors, and we are told that we must drink more foreign liquor, so these huge industries may export more goods from this country. The American small businessman, the American taxpayer is footing the bill and is asked to drown his sorrows in more foreign liquor. I hope this high-pressure lobby which has been paid $21,000 plus expenses for deceiving the American public will be brought out into the open where every American citizen can see it.

It was through the power of false propaganda that the iniquitous Trade Agreement Act was passed. Countries were on the verge of war. Our people, 80 percent of them, wanted peace. The advocates of the trade-agreement program knew this and immediately set to work to take advantage of the distraught mind of our people. Why not, said the sponsors of the trade-agreement program, couple foreign trade and peace as a means of putting over the trade-agreement program. This was done. The country was blanketed with propaganda to the effect that the trade-agreement program would make for peace. Women's organizations were propagandized to the limit. The theme song in the press, over the radio, in the movies, and through a deluge of literature all paid for by the taxpayers, was to the effect that peace could come only through foreign trade. Naturally, the mothers of the country were for anything that would keep this Nation out of war. The trade-agreement program was the only true road to universal peace and brotherly love. It was stressed in a Nation-wide appeal to every mother in the land that if she would save her son from the horrors of war nothing must stand in the way of the enactment of the trade-agreement bill. Emotionalism on this issue of peace by trade agreements was raised to hysterical heights. It worked. The trade-agreement bill was enacted into law in 1934. Did it keep us out of war? It did not. Instead it ushered in and contributed to one of the most destructive wars in all history.

What other appeal was made to bring support to the trade-agreement program? It was urged by the New Deal proponents of this scheme, that if adopted, the trade agreements would be

the means of increasing our exports. Did it increase exports? No; the New Deal advocates soon found to their consternation that our exports did not increase under the low-tariff policy of the Trade Agreement Act. Thus, the New Dealers in the State Department were faced with the dilemma that their program did not prevent war and the further fact that it did not increase exports. They realized that they could only save face by developing at all costs, whether in American blood or money, an increase in our exports. To meet their desperate problem, the free-trade internationalists in the State Department went into a huddle to see if they could find a solution for their diminishing exports. World conditions were in their favor. The dictators, Mussolini, Hitler, and Hirohito, were in desperate need of war materials.

This was manna from heaven for the State Department free-traders. Here was an opportunity to build up exports by the sale and shipment of vast quantities of war materials to the aggressors. Thus the trade-agreement program was to be saved by exporting raw cotton, petroleum, aviation gasoline, iron and steel scrap, steel ingots, tin plate, tin-plate scrap, refined copper, copper scrap, motortrucks, aircraft and parts, machine tools, firearms and ammunition.

Here was a demonstration of the good-neighbor policy with a bloody vengeance. These exports, the New Dealers felt confident, would convince the public that the trade-agreement policy had fulfilled the promise of increased exports. Where were these war materials shipped? They were shipped to Germany, Italy, and Japan during the years 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1940. If there were any virtue in the trade-agreement program, then with all these countless tons of war materials our exports ought not to have been 20 percent less under so-called reciprocity than under the American tariff system, but such was the result. I may add that this arming of aggressors with war materials herein mentioned, and more, to build up a case for the trade-agreement program, did not square with the good-neighbor policy and the peace policy so piously enunciated as a reason for enacting the program in 1934 and for the subsequent extensions of the Trade Agreements Act.

I may add further that if the State Department officials were not aware that they were depleting our national resources to supply aggressor nations with vital war materials, their combined astuteness was far behind that of the average American citizen.

The gruesome fact is that millions of our boys had to face the impact of these war materials which the New Deal trade agreement proponents caused to be shipped to the stock piles of the aggressors. The loss of the battleship *Arizona* and seven others damaged can be charged to the trade-agreement policy of shipping 8,000,000 tons of scrap iron, steel, and other materials to Japan in a wild effort to build up exports.

Those of you who have read Wendell Willkie's One World no doubt found a reference to this question of shipping scrap iron to Japan. What did the trade-agreement sponsors care about the use that would be made of these war materials as long as it built up a fake case for their promised exports under the trade-agreement program? Would they listen to the protest of those who saw in this stock pile of war material the murder of men, women, and children? No. The program of deception must be carried out regardless of its cost in human lives. The casualties at Pearl Harbor alone were 2,117 killed in the Navy and Marine Corps with 900 missing. Does it not matter to the trade-agreement advocates and the internationalists that this fake export program furnished our enemies with the materials they needed to accomplish that dastardly act and that our enemies bragged about it as indicative of their superior diplomacy? The same group is again shouting peace, brotherly love, increased exports through free trade, as an inducement to the emotional and the selfish to support a further reduction of the tariffs.

All that is required to create a utopian world of unlimited international trade and prosperity, so the American people are told by the internationalists, is to lend and lend billions and billions of our taxpayers' money to foreign nations with which to buy our automobiles and other American products. This prosperity will last just so long and no longer than the American taxpayer can lend the money to the foreigners to buy our products. This artificial stimulation, this needling of the arm of normal trade, can bring us nothing but headaches and obligations that will weigh heaviest upon us when we can least afford to meet them.

This effort to deceive the American people on the subject of increased exports had other serious repercussions. This typical New Deal subterfuge, this double dealing with the American people, contributed to the death of thousands of our boys. It caused thousands of them to be blinded and crippled for life. To reveal the entire ghastly picture of the trade-agreement program would require volumes. Without fear of successful contradiction it can be truthfully said that the trade-agreement program did not tend to appease or stabilize or contribute to world peace. It did, however, add to the fury of the fight and the wholesale slaughter of our boys. Those of us who opposed the arming of our potential enemies protested these shipments; but to no avail. On numerous occasions in 1938, 1939, and 1940, I stood upon this floor and warned the country of what the export-hungry State Department was doing to us. Today I deplore the fact that after such a record of New Deal treachery we find the same group now operating behind the iron curtain of the State Department, again seeking to plague our national economy by advocating a further reduction in our tariff duties.

What do these free-trade experts and exponents now urge as a reason for again lowering tariff rates? Some of them still insist that a further reduction of tariffs will insure future peace. Others take it for granted that the people have forgotten what was said in 1934 with reference to stimulating our exports, which the trade agreements have deplorably failed to do. Whether the people who were swindled during the trade-agreement era, with reference to the promised exports and the prevention of war have had enough of this double dealing I do not know. I am sure that they have not forgotten what the program cost the United States in blood, suffering, and wealth as a result of arming Japan, Germany, and Italy. It is enough to say at this point that had it not been for these shipments of war materials it is quite possible that there would have been no Pearl Harbor and probably no war of consequence in the Pacific.

In another speech which I made I reduced these shipments to airplanes, tanks, submarines, and battleships, and it is the most astounding picture, at a time when we lacked the materials to get ready for war. I will go into that just a little later.

Thousands of mothers today are without the sons who died gloriously to protect the American way of life. Those boys were killed, many of them, by the very metals and other materials our State Department shipped so frantically to support its ill-considered theory.

But we are again confronted with the same old appeal that the lowering of duties on imported goods will increase our exports, create good will, prevent war, and thus enrich our Nation. I want to call attention to a very significant fact with reference to this question of exports. The record shows that during the last 5-year prewar peacetime period of prosperity in the United States—that is from 1925 to 1929—our national revenue from customs duties averaged almost $600,000,000 per annum. To be exact, $580,748,055. Now then, here is the contrast: During the 5-year period under reciprocal-trade agreements preceding World War II, that is from 1935 to 1939 inclusive, our national revenue from custom duties averaged considerably less than $400,000,000 annually. To be exact, $378,909,157. What about our loss of revenue over a period of 10 years under the trade-agreement program? The fact is that the decrease in national revenue under the trade-agreement program has exceeded $200,000,000 annually or the equivalent of $2,000,000,000 in a period of 10 years.

I would say that this is a considerable sacrifice in national revenue incident to an unrealistic, experimental change in economic policy, and again may I add, it failed to keep us out of war or to increase our exports. Moreover, when the year 1939 is compared with 1929, the decrease in revenue is from $600,000,000 to $300,000,000, a decrease of 50 percent. I do not like to use statistics when addressing my colleagues, but it is of the utmost importance that this whole free-trade program should be debunked. We have suffered enough from listening to false statements and emotional appeals on this question of increased exports as a means of building up our prosperity. This decrease in revenue during the reciprocal trade program is no small matter in view of the terrific burden of national debt

which hangs like a cloud over our economy. The decrease in revenue to which I have referred cannot be accounted for as a result of a falling off in the quantity of imports. It is only necessary in this connection to compare the imports during the 5-year period from 1925 to 1929 with the recent 5-year period from 1935 to 1939. Not only this, but the physical quantity of imports in 1937 was exactly the same as the physical quantity of imports during the most prosperous year of all, 1929. It is significant, too, that the average physical quantity of imports during the two 5-year periods, namely, 1925–29 and 1935–39, did not vary more than 5 percent.

Let me repeat for emphasis that the physical volume of exports was actually 20 percent less under reciprocity than under the American system of prosperity at home. Not only was the physical quantity of exports 20 percent less under reciprocity than during 1925–29, but the exports under reciprocity included huge quantities of scrap iron and steel, petroleum products for military purposes, trucks, tractors, and other vehicles, machinery for making war implements, and stock piles of cotton, grain, tobacco, and other products.

To put this whole matter bluntly, our concession as to tariff rates merely meant loss of revenue and injury to the domestic market, while such foreign concessions as were claimed to have been made to us not only did not build up our export trade but merely made it possible for foreign enemy governments to equip themselves for World War II.

It is interesting to go back and look at the record. When the appeal was being made to get the farmers to support the trade-agreement program, I recall that when Secretary Hull appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in 1937 urging an extension of the trade-agreement program, he stated:

> A primary purpose of this trade-agreement program, and it has no more paramount purpose, is to restore as far as possible the foreign markets for American agriculture.

I do not regard it impertinent to ask at this point whether the trade agreements did restore the foreign market for American agriculture. I can say definitely that it did not. Instead, when the New Deal administration realized that the reciprocal-trade program was not increasing our exports of farm surpluses it embarked in July 1938 on a major export subsidy program. To be more specific, the men behind the iron curtain in the State Department saw no objection to our dumping our goods upon the market of other nations. In an effort to prove that the trade agreements would open foreign markets for agriculture, 116,293,000 bushels of wheat were subsidized for export between July 1938 and November 1939 at a cost of approximately $32,871,000 in subsidies. It is true also that from July 27, 1939, through November 1939, 4,340,297 bales of cotton were exported at a cost, for the subsidy alone, of approximately $34,844,000.

Thus, through the failure of the reciprocal trade-agreement program to move our agricultural surpluses, it cost our taxpayers in subsidies $67,715,000 during the period of 16 months, August 1938 through November 1939.

The advocates of the trade-agreement program, as a means of removing our surplus farm commodities, were becoming desperate. Something had to be done. They even went so far as to bring the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation into action in the fiscal year 1938 and 1939 and through it spent $30,479,112 for the surplus removal operations of 20 commodities while imports of these same commodities during the same period were valued at $92,298,000. This shows clearly that our surplus commodities were not removed by the low-tariff program.

I may say that dumping is the practice of selling goods in the foreign market at a price below that charged for the same goods in the domestic market, and often at a price below the cost of production and shipment abroad.

Needless to say, dumping is an unfair international trade practice, and has been vigorously condemned as such by our Government. Now then, closely akin to dumping is the practice of governments in subsidizing in one way and another the export of goods by their nationals so that the product may be sold in foreign markets below the domestic price. Furthermore, dumping has always been fruitful of international resentment and discord. Thus, the international ethics and idealism, of which the New Deal administration prates so often and so loudly, were and are deliberately violated by this subsidy, dumping program.

For example, some of our free-trade friends made rash promises abroad about dismantling our synthetic rubber plants and have apparently never dreamed of using surplus crops to make the rubber that we dare not be without again. We have hundreds of millions of dollars invested in synthetic rubber plants, some designed to use alcohol, some for petroleum. If the Government, which now operates those plants, used grain, or even potatoes, to make alcohol for those plants we would be making use of the bounties of nature and not destroying them or dumping them on foreign markets. With grain at 25 to 35 cents a bushel, rubber can be made as cheaply as from petroleum, and if we must do that rather than destroy the grain or dump it on foreign markets at the expense of the good will of foreign countries, then why not try it out? We could do a lot of things if we paid a little attention to tidying up our own house before we begin telling other nations how the world should be run.

I am not surprised that our laboring men as well as our farmers are beginning to realize the danger that confronts them under the trade-agreement program. The friends of labor have striven for many years to build up sound immigration laws which of course are being undermined by the lowering of the duties on products made by cheap labor abroad. There is no surer way of destroying the pay rolls of this country than to transfer them to other countries under a low-tariff policy. Is it wise for the United States to continue a policy that will ultimately weaken the social protection and security programs built up by the National Government and States for the promotion of production and security of the great mass of individuals privately employed? I do not want to see the United States continue an international trade policy under the trade-agreements program that will nullify our anti-child-labor legislation, the laws eliminating sweatshops, laws prescribing sanitary and health conditions, both in places of employment and in residential districts. I know that it is an unwise public policy to throw those, who labor on farms and in factories, in competition in our market with the people of those areas abroad where conditions are so bad as a result of poor sanitary conditions and disease that the average span of life is 25 to 30 years. This, however, is what the men now supporting the trade-agreement program would have us do.

A glance at the record of statutory enactments during the last half century and longer will show that the people of the United States under a system of representative republican States and national governments have been aware of the importance of protecting all individuals, producers, consumers, and all special groups against any and all forms of unfair public practices. One of the purposes of the Federal Trade Commission is to provide for legal action in the courts of the land to protect our people from such unfair trade practices. Why destroy all of this security by opening our market to foreign producers who are not required to meet the standards we require of our producers? I maintain that it is just as essential to protect our people from the unfair practices of foreign governments as it is to protect them from the unfair practices of domestic concerns.

I believe our people are fully aware that a multitude of different forms of unfair methods of competition such as dumping, quotas, licenses, and many foreign discriminations were introduced or resulted from the so-called reciprocal trade agreements entered into by the United States with foreign countries and between foreign countries.

The thought never entered the minds of the trade agreement negotiators of our State Department as to the importance of the child-labor laws, minimum hours of labor for adults, comparable to ours in countries competing in our market. I had always supposed that social legislation had a tendency to increase the price of our manufactured product, and therefor placed in a position of disadvantage the home industry subjected to all such laws unless similar laws were in force in all competing countries, but the trade agreements experts disagree. It would be interesting to know how many nations with which we have trade agreements have minimum hours of labor comparable to ours.

Do the nations with whom we have trade agreements have to meet our standards affecting health and safety, such as sanitation, lighting, safeguards from dangerous machinery and chemicals, compensation for injuries sustained while at work, insurance of health, insurance against unemployment, pensions or insurance against old age, extra pay

for night work, special provisions prohibiting, limiting, or regulating child labor and special laws to protect working women? Laws and regulations such as those I have enumerated enter into the cost of production in the United States. I know of no other nation with comparable requirements. These wholesome laws will have little effect in protecting our labor standards if importing nations can ignore them.

I am firmly convinced that instead of the vast maze of confusing schemes to dominate or to overplay our part of leader throughout the world it would be a much wiser policy for commercial economic treaties to include all such reciprocal concessions as may meet the judgment of the legislative branches of the different countries in which the people make their own policies.

The Congress of the United States should express the mature judgment of the people.

We have had much talk during the last decade or more about tariff rates under the act of 1930. Yet, twice as many items or commodities were placed upon the free list as were made subject to duty. One more reduction, such as is contemplated, and this with the action planned at Geneva in April will bring free trade to the United States. It has been well demonstrated that unless the cost of production here and abroad of articles entering our market is taken into consideration and adequate protection provided for our producers against low production costs abroad there will be a steady decline in the production of those articles here.

I claim it is folly to ignore the items of cost that enter into our production in this country as against the cost of production of competitive articles abroad.

For instance, postal service here is operating at a deficit, an item which enters into the cost of production. The same is true of good roads, education, health, and sanitation and a host of other expenses which other countries do not have to meet at the same high level of cost as we do here.

Is it to the interest of our Republic to entrust the State Department, in view of its infiltration by Communists, with negotiations relating to our trade with 18 foreign nations?

I believe in the sanctity of our constitutional principles in the conduct of both our domestic and our foreign relations. I did not come here as a horse trader, but as a legislator sworn to preserve, protect, and defend our Constitution. The jurisdiction of trade agreements relating to revenue is a subject of legislation that must originate in the House, unless and until what are now passed off as trade agreements are raised to the dignity of treaties.

If it is to our benefit to lower a tariff rate here or there, and if it can be shown that it would really benefit us, and that such reduction would in no way injure domestic producers or interfere with the American right of free enterprise, then let Republicans and Democrats alike combine to reduce that rate. Let it be done in good order and with dignity, with all the facts on the table. If flexible tariffs are required, then let them be adjusted by experts and after a full and proper investigation. This petty bargaining by men who know nothing of commodities and too much of secret diplomatic horse trading cannot possibly result in anything but the creation of world-wide barriers erected solely or largely for the purpose of betting them against those of other countries.

Can it be to the interest of our Republic to entrust the future of hundreds of domestic industries, many of them founded in blood and sweat, to a handful of Communist-minded self-admitted internationalists? Surely it has become evident by this time that the further this country departs from our traditional foreign policy of nonintervention in the political affairs of other countries, the greater will be the cost in lives, industry, and prestige.

Many of the 18 foreign nations at the proposed meeting in Geneva will represent ideologies in utter conflict with the philosophy of our Republic. Is it this fact that has finally caused the Chief Executive to finally awaken to the fact that all the trade agreements entered into, except one, contained no safety provision to prevent the wiping out of a vital domestic industry? He has said that anyone who thinks he has the power to limit or stop imports that may be destroying an American industry and putting American labor out of work is "laboring under a fundamental misapprehension." To paraphrase, "Your cause may be just, but I can do nothing for you." And all this time vital information concerning our trade-agreement program is kept from the public, which is being propagandized and misled, while the information it cannot get is handed out to foreign nations.

I claim for myself and for the people of this great country the right to vote on such a vital issue as whether we shall have absolutely free trade, the obvious object of this whole program—so obvious, in fact, that they flaunt it in our faces. I quote the exact words of one of the panel members hearing testimony for the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Discussing the present program, he said:

> The answer in the ultimate would be no tariffs at all, complete freedom from controls. It is just one part of a whole pattern and working toward trade freedom and free enterprise in trade.

Gentleman, I warn you as I have done before, that the industries of this country are hanging by a thread, and that thread is being frayed more and more as these trade agreements are forced upon us and upon other nations by a group which admittedly would sacrifice the sanctity of the American way of life for a mess of foreign-brewed pottage.

I want to call your attention to another very vital proposition now before this country. In my comments about copper shipped to Japan, at a time when we should have had all of those resources here to build up for the war that was coming, there were sent out of this country over 358,623 tons of copper. Now, let us see how these silly, stupid theorists and Communists down in the State Department acted, urging exports to build up a fake program, and what that has done to our country at the present time. When I mention that amount of copper I am not mentioning the amount that was shipped to Germany, and I traveled abroad on a ship that was loaded as heavily as they could load it with copper for Germany 6 weeks before the war. Then there was what we sent to Italy, but that which was sunk at sea, has not been mentioned.

You members of the Ways and Means Committee will recall when we wanted to get ready for war we were so stripped of all these essential war materials. Take scrap iron alone. The State Department came before our committee and wanted us to remove the tariffs so they could send junk dealers down to Central America, down into the Caribbean Sea area and into South America to tear up old sugar mills, abandoned sugar mills, and other steel scrap to be shipped here so that we could begin to really prepare for our own entrance into the war that we saw coming.

Now in regard to the copper. You will recall that the school children of this country were required to contribute copper pennies for war purposes. The people are still flooded with iron pennies because the copper had been exported to our enemies. Today, according to all the reports that are pouring in from industries, as the Members of the House know, copper is reduced to the vanishing point. Every industry of consequence in this country may soon be slowed down for want of copper. Some are slowing down now. Now, we have to get away from this group down in the State Department who have done such a disservice to our country. We would not have been short; we would have had enough to take care of ourselves and our Allies and still enough to run our factories at full employment for many months hence if they had not ignored the vital interests of our country. Our automobile concerns and others are desperately short of copper. They are not in shape to go ahead without copper. This Congress, if it has the vision, which I believe it has, will have to come to the relief of industry and labor. A supply of copper will have to be found or our country will take a nose dive. There is no bureaucrat wise enough to meet the problems of the Nation. He may have the highest degree in his college, a Phi Beta Kappa key, or what not; yet when he comes out of college and goes to the bureau, perhaps saturated with communism, and starts to formulate the industrial policy, the economic policy of this country, and also attempts to run our foreign affairs, the ultimate result is too dangerous to contemplate.

Copper is holding up the housing for our veterans. We all know now, of course, that the housing program that was brought in here and passed has been a failure. But even so, neither free enterprise nor the Government has copper. Pipes and plumbing and the various articles which are needed are not available. We are paying the price of bureaucratic bungling and we are bound to pay a price and a serious price which is now endangering and will continue to endanger our

Nation. Time and again the businessmen have come here, like the people who need copper, for relief only to find shortages from bureaucratic ineptitude. Congress can hear the evidence and act for our citizens but for them to seek relief from bureaucracy is fatal to their business. But what do they do behind the iron curtain down at the State Department? The time has come when we should speak for the sovereign people who, in the aggregate, know what is best for this country.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has given us some very shocking information. It will startle the people of this country when they learn that many of the half-truths and misleading statements they have heard regarding the question before us were paid for by a high-pressure professional registered lobby.

One cannot blame an honest American citizen, who believes in world peace and a maximum of beneficial world trade, for supporting legislation which he believes would promote those interests. He will not be happy when he learns that he has been misled by a high-pressure lobby employed by those who are more interested in profits of huge exports than in a well-balanced American economy.

Most of the industries supporting the pseudo Trade Agreement Act and its long-term extension are enjoying huge profits because of their exports. That the American taxpayer and the small-business man of the country are paying "through the nose" for those shipments abroad seems not to stop their clamor for more exports and more profits.

I call attention to the firms behind the highly paid professional lobby which is endeavoring to continue the President's autocratic power. International this—and international that—all through the list of supporters you will find huge American companies operating internationally. It makes little difference to them whether they support American labor or foreign labor as long as they reap their profits.

Now, what about the average small business man? I am sure there are some who support the administration's plan for an unimproved, unlimited extension of the President's power to make trade agreements. Undoubtedly the big majority of those who do happen to favor outright extension have been misled by this lobby into the belief that it is necessary for the peace and prosperity of this country.

The bill before you, rather than being a hindrance to the peace and prosperity of this country, is an affirmative step in the direction of a more secure world and a more prosperous economy for our own country. No high-pressure lobby can prove the contrary.

Our President, like his predecessor, continues a drive for unlimited, unrestricted, autocratic power. Just where small-business interests fit into the picture rests completely in his hands. A large proportion of the fabulous exports from this country consist of unnecessary and unneeded items shipped to various countries. Bear in mind that you and I and the small-business man are paying through the nose for those exports. We are not exporting in the real sense of the word, for although these huge international companies reap greater harvest, the money came from our own tax collector.

The Tariff Commission has always considered the interests of the domestic consumer, the domestic producer, and importer and the exporter. Its reports have been unbiased and favored no particular class. There is no Government agency better qualified than the Tariff Commission to indicate how low a tariff may be cut without endangering our domestic industry. Small business cannot be blamed for mistrusting our State Department. They have been on the giving end for 14 years and have given up hope of receiving anything from our diplomatic negotiators who are so involved in international affairs that they seem to have forgotten there is a United States.

It is shameful that the American people can be open to the propaganda devised by a professional highly-paid lobby supported by a few international industrial firms which believe in free trade and which desire to continue their abnormal exports at the American taxpayer's, worker's, and producer's expense. The disclosure of Mr. REED is timely indeed.

If we are to continue to be a diversified country, where man may labor at the profession of his choice; if our economy is not to be regimented, then we must vote for this bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, what this House is faced with now is a choice of one of three things: We either can do nothing at all by defeating all the legislation that is before us, an act that I think would be completely irresponsible, and one which I hope very much that this House will not take; or, we can vote for the motion which undoubtedly will be made for recommittal to extend the existing law for 3 years exactly as is; or, we can vote for the bill as proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means.

During this discussion it seems to me that many statements have been made, particularly on the minority side with respect to this proposal that is now before us, which are entirely beside the point. The point is whether or not we are going to extend reciprocal trade agreements for a period of 1 year, and to what extent, if any, we are going to change the machinery for the initiation of those agreements. That machinery, as I see it in this proposal, is changed in very minor particulars, but in particulars that in my opinion will allow the policy enunciated therein to become perhaps a permanent policy of this Government. During the last 14 years the Executive has been given by the Congress complete power within brackets set by the Congress to initiate any type of trade agreement that he has seen fit. We extended those brackets from 50 percent, which existed between 1934 and 1945, to an additional 50 percent of the 1945 rates only 2 years ago. During that period trade agreements have been negotiated with almost every country in the world. There are only a few left with which such agreements have not been negotiated. Apparently the administration itself feels that we have gone as far down in cutting tariffs as it itself would like to go. Hence, why this worry in regard to this new procedure which makes only two changes. One, it substitutes by law the Tariff Commission as the committee which recommends to the President how safely he can change the existing tariff rates up or down, without doing one of two things, namely, seriously injuring or threatening to injure American business or injuring our national defense. That is the first change. Secondly, the President initiates agreements exactly as he does today, but if he goes beyond the limits recommended by the Tariff Commission—and I think every friend of reciprocal trade agreements will admit that we have practically gone to the limit already—if he exceeds the limit recommended by the Tariff Commission, he submits the matter to the Congress with his reasons for doing so—and presumably they would be very good reasons if he has done so—and then we would have the opportunity of vetoing the agreement, as I think we properly should. Otherwise, if we do not act within 60 days the agreement becomes law.

My friends on the right side of the aisle here have been talking about the effect of this on our relations with peoples overseas. In my opinion there has been a tremendous exaggeration as to the effect of the change that is proposed here on our friends overseas. It is only if they are told what is not the truth from the document that we have before us, that this country is shifting entirely its policy of negotiating trade agreements, that there might be some effect, and what disturbs me most in this entire debate is the position taken by our Democratic friends that we are doing irreparable damage as far as the world itself is concerned. If one reads the text of the document there is absolutely no justification for that position. I regret, therefore, that this has become a partisan matter, since I think by and large the proposal that has been recommended here by the Committee on Ways and Means is one not only in our interest but in the interest of maintaining a stable policy which the Congress, I hope, will go along with for many years to come.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill, which is the death warrant of the reciprocal trade agreements program. It is the handiwork of those who have always been against this great program, the continuance of which is vital to the prosperity, peace, and general welfare of the United States. The reciprocal-trade program is the monumental accomplishment of an illustrious former Member of this body, the emi-

nent former Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. It was of great importance when it was recommended by a Democratic President and enacted by a Democratic Congress in 1934. It is much more important and necessary now. The program has been continued by act of Congress four times since the original enactment, and every time except in 1943, in the midst of world war, a large majority of the Republicans have voted against this vital measure for international trade and friendship..

The enemies of reciprocal trade agreements do not have the courage to kill this great program outright. They dare not formally terminate it. They are afraid to let it expire June 12, as it will unless renewed. The country will not be deceived by this delusion and sham. Its enactment in this form would be only a nominal extension with hamstringing limitations that would render it ineffective as the basis of world trade and international good will. It would practically nullify this great program as an instrumentality of prosperity and peace.

Our Republican friends are deceiving only themselves if they think they can deceive the American people by this flimsy pretext of continuing the reciprocal trade program. It is apparent that they are acting in bad faith. If they were not they would support the bill introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], favored by all of the Democrats on the committee, for a 3-year extension. If they were acting in good faith with the American people they would not propose this unworkable plan. They would not have held a star-chamber hearing, and they would not have adopted this gag rule forbidding amendments, if they did not intend to render virtually impossible the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements.

BACK TO LOGROLLING IN TARIFFS

It is obvious that the present isolationist, reactionary national leadership of the Republican Party—those who dominate its councils and dictate its policies—are still living in the era of Mark Hanna and McKinley, and have not learned a lesson from two devastating world wars and a never-to-be-forgotten depression. This is a sample of what they would do if they were entrusted with a long lease on power. They would go back to the "good old days"; back to "normalcy"; back to logrolling in tariff making; back to the methods of the Hawley-Smoot tariff, the schedules of which were dictated largely by the chief lobbyist of the tariff barons and noted gatherer of Republican campaign funds, their "Uncle Joe" Grundy, who brazenly stated to a senatorial committee that his purpose was to write such a bill as would return a profit to large contributors to the Hoover campaign chest of 1928.

MY SPEECH 16 YEARS AGO

On January 9, 1932, in a speech in this Chamber, I said:

Foreign trade is a system of barter. If we sell, we must also buy. By enacting into law the prohibitive rates of the Hawley-Smoot tariff they erected a Chinese wall around American ports, which constitutes an insuperable barrier to our profitable foreign commerce. They closed our markets to friendly foreign customers, and month by month our favorable balance of trade, which Mr. Hoover said was the basis of our prosperity, is slipping away. In return 40 nations have raised tariff walls against American products, and many of them are undisguisedly intended as measures of reprisal. They have closed their doors in our faces.

Those countries to which we said by this act of legislative folly: "We do not want to trade with you", those to which we said, in the words of President Hoover, "We are able in considerable degree to free ourselves of world influence and make a large measure of independent recovery because we are so remarkably self-contained"—those countries have ceased to purchase the surplus products of American farms.

* * * * *

This law which has wrought havoc in industry, driven hundreds of factories from American soil, augmented the ranks of the unemployed, and destroyed the farmers' markets is recognized generally as a colossal economic blunder. * * *

America is a peace-loving nation and cherishes the laudable aspiration to avoid future wars, with all the suffering and horror that accompany them and their aftermath. Most wars have been economic wars, and who can be so blind as not to see that there are germs of war in economic reprisals such as are involved in retaliatory tariffs of the kind being levied against us by more than 40 nations as the direct result of this legislative iniquity—the Grundy-Hoover tariff?

REPUBLICAN TARIFF DESTROYED DARK TOBACCO MARKETS

A striking example of the effect on American agriculture of a liberal dose of Hawley-Smoot tariff tonic is the calamity it inflicted on dark and burley tobacco growers of Kentucky and other States. The principal money crop in western Kentucky and Tennessee for generations has been dark tobacco, largely an export product. The district that has long honored me with membership in this House is the greatest burley tobacco producing district in the world, and Lexington, its center and metropolis, is the largest loose-leaf tobacco market in the world. Burley tobacco is also the principal money crop of a part of Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, Missouri, Indiana, Ohio, and West Virginia. Burley is, and was then, used largely for domestic manufacture. When the Hawley-Smoot tariff caused the collapse of American commerce, and closed the American markets to the countries that were the more important purchasers of dark air-cured and fire-cured tobacco, it also virtually destroyed the foreign market for those types of tobacco and prostrated the dark tobacco industry in America. Those farmers, accustomed for generations to depend on tobacco as their money crop, with their markets destroyed, knew no alternative except to resort to the cultivation of burley tobacco, for which there was a domestic market, with the result that every pound of burley grown in the dark tobacco area diminished the price of every pound grown in the burley area, and depreciated the value of every acre of land in the great burley belt, as a consequence of which both burley and dark tobacco sold for less than the cost of production and thousands of farmers in Kentucky, Tennessee, and other tobacco-growing States were unable even to pay their taxes.

This bill authorizes tariff schedules even 50 percent higher than the rates of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930, which paralyzed American industry, wrecked American commerce and impoverished American agriculture.

In that same speech in the House of Representatives on January 9, 1932, I advocated an international economic conference which I said I believed "would go far in promoting friendly reciprocal trade agreements, in lowering discriminatory and prohibitive tariff walls, in bringing a return of prosperity to our country, and in advancing America to practical realization of the Jeffersonian conception, expressed in his immortal first inaugural address, of 'peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations.'"

THIS BILL IS RETREAT FROM LEADERSHIP IN PEACE

The reciprocal trade agreements program is vital and essential to our plan of international cooperation and fundamental in our aspiration for world peace. We recently participated at Habana with 52 other nations in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment. We are 1 of 23 nations, representing two-thirds of all the foreign commerce in the world, that negotiated trade agreements at Geneva last year, the most far-reaching trade program in history. We have adopted the Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of the industry, the employment of the people, and the economic recovery of the free nations of western Europe, so recently seared by the flames and riven by the plowshare of war. It is a great forward movement for enlightened and peaceful international cooperation. We must continue to go forward. Under the terms of this bill we would beat a hasty and ignominious retreat. If it becomes a law the news will be flashed around the world that this great Republic has abdicated its exalted position of leadership in striving for friendly commerce and international good will.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be proper to go over this situation generally and in review to drift back to the period of 1928 to 1932 and bring it up to date. You remember the hilarious era of 1928 to 1932, that Hooverian era of the economic joyride sponsored by the Grundyites, the Smoot-Hawley adherents, and the sanctimonious Tariff League. The plunder bund at that time ran riot and brought ruin and left a trail of broken hearts and suicides from one end of the country to the other. You remember those days: Bankruptcy on all sides and among all classes, banks closed, factories boarded up, sheriffs' sales of farms in every State in the Union, and apples, instead of being sold in bulk in foreign markets, were peddled piecemeal by the unfortunate workers on the street corners of our big cities. Apples once again became a symbol of weakness and desperation. Those were the days when the rank and file both among individuals and business

were down and out, but the plunder-bund, thanks to the Tariff League credo, were prosperous, they were, in fact, bloated, they were satisfied under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

Then in 1932 the people of the United States were fed up. They got wise, and they voted and they turned the rascals out. In 1933 the Democrats came in, Roosevelt and the great Cordell Hull, from the rugged hills of Tennessee, at his side. What an inspiration that man was in his advocacy of the trade agreements. He took on all comers before our committee. He smacked down the opposition one at a time. They were no match for him at anytime. It got so that not one of them dared to challenge him when he spoke because he had the right answer for everyone who dared question his wisdom.

We revived stagnant trade and industry by way of the trade agreements, and prosperity returned to America. Our products, the products of the farm and of the mine and of the bill, as the barriers were reduced, were sold in the markets of the world in ever-increasing quantities. That brought prosperity to all. But the plunder-bund, the Tariff League, the Smoot-Hawley boys, and the Grundyites, of Pennsylvania, were a sullen, sorry, disappointed bunch. So they wormed their way in once again, and in 1946, after a cleverly concocted scheme whereby the people of the land were misled, they succeeded in electing a majority of both Houses.

How this was brought about is a matter of history. You remember that we had a dozen or more unofficial Republican smelling committees going all over the Nation raising Cain about the high prices of food and the shortage of sugar and the lack of this, that, and something else, and they talked about the housing shortage. Why, bless your heart, they even sent a spokesman for the American Legion into Detroit to carry on some kind of hearings there during the last campaign. He charged the administration with all the sins of omission and commission that you could think of. He charged even that we were hoarding building supplies because somewhere or other someone discovered 10 kegs of nails in a Government warehouse. They misled the people into believing that the shortages and high prices were all the fault of the administration then in power, and that the salvation of the people lay in the hands of the solicitous Republicans. These committees held unauthorized, fake, partisan hearings. I presume these were financed by the Republican National Committee, because they traveled all over the country and for impressiveness held their spurious meetings in courthouses and the like and made the people believe that they were carrying on a bona fide investigation. It was just a lot of bunk and propaganda to mislead the people. At any rate, they succeeded in pulling the wool over the people's eyes. Then, after they came into power and killed the OPA, raised prices, gutted the Housing Act, and otherwise wrecked the set-up hereabout, they are now out for big stakes. The plunder-bund must be satisfied right down to the last dime and nickel in the pocket of the American public. The trusting people are now being led to the slaughter by a Judas goat. But this frolic is not going to last forever. Once the American public get wise to the direction in which they are being led, there will be another day of reckoning. Once again the tide will turn and the situation will be corrected. It appears as ridiculous to me that the majority report covers scarcely more than one page actually dealing with the move before us, while the minority report covers comprehensively the remainder of the 18 pages of the report or 13 pages of sound reasoning applied as to why the bill should be killed and the trade agreements extended for the full period of 3 years.

This report contains a list of newspaper articles and refers to a large number of intelligent, able, and well-known commentators, all of whom are in favor of extension of the trade agreements. For the most part, these people are writing for Republican newspapers. There is one paper that very few people know about; it is conspicuously absent from the list; it doubtlessly carries an awful lot of weight—not in its own environs, not in its own home State, not in its own great metropolitan area of 2,916 population, and you probably never heard about it—it is the Wadena (Minn.) Pioneer Journal.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. This paper is published by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It does not cut much of a figure in its own home town, but evidently carries a lot of influence in this chamber, particularly with the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means who had the courage to bring this bill before the House.

Seemingly, the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee and the well-whipped and well-disciplined members of the majority who attended yesterday's Republican caucus—I am surprised that any of them can be sitting down today after the lashing they got yesterday to get into line—it does not make any difference to them, I say; but the preponderance of evidence presented before the committee over the question of extension of the trade agreements every time it came up, and presented by consumers, producers, merchant, manufacturers, bankers, shippers, farmers, workers, publishers, chambers of commerce, trade and business organizations, labor organizations, all of those representing billions in investment and millions in employed, in overwhelming numbers favored the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. But evidence did not cut any ice. The word went down from the plunder-bund that "We have had enough of restriction. We want to be free henceforth."

Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us, H. R. 6556, is strictly a one-way high-tariff bill. Section by section it points toward tariff levels even higher than the iniquitous Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930 which helped to bring on and intensify the worst depression this country has ever seen. It is part and parcel of the tariff policy which, in the early 1930's, drove workers from jobs to bread lines, wrecked American foreign commerce, and bankrupted American farmers by the thousands.

Brought here under the flimsy disguise of a measure for extending the reciprocal trade-agreements program, it is actually and brazenly a weapon for killing the program. To enact this bill would amount to handing the old high-tariff crowd a set of loaded dice and telling them the sky is the limit.

This bill is designed solely to pacify, shelter, and cherish a minor segment of the American economy which wants to shut out all competition from abroad. It is designed to do this without regard to the welfare of a much larger portion of our national productive capacity, which would eventually find both its domestic and its foreign markets drastically curtailed if the bill should pass.

More than two and one-third million American industrial workers depend, for their jobs, directly or indirectly, on exports. This bill would do nothing whatever to enlarge or maintain the foreign markets for their products. Many of the most important agricultural enterprises in the United States—wheat, cotton, tobacco, corn, and hogs, and fruit, for example—must have foreign markets to absorb their full production and give decent prices to farmers. This bill would do nothing toward maintaining or improving those markets. Under the provisions of this bill a few enterprises of comparatively small importance in relation to the national plant as a whole would be given excessive tariff protection at the expense of consumers, farmers, and efficient manufacturing industries which give employment, pay the highest wages, and create buying power in our great domestic market.

This is a vital, dollar-and-cents matter to every citizen of my own State of Michigan—whether he is an industrial worker, a farmer, or a businessman. Foreign trade is of major importance to Michigan. The automobile industry's stake in foreign markets goes back many years. One out of every 10 automobiles manufactured in the United States has been sold abroad. The most important Michigan economic enterprises, in addition to the automobile industry, produce goods of the kinds which the United States exports. In this list we include our iron and steel products, electrical and other machinery, meat products, wheat and flour, fruits, wood and wood products, and many others.

In 1939 Michigan enterprises of the type I have described produced goods to the value of more than $3,500,000,000; they employed more than half a million people; and they paid out $813,000,000 in wages and salaries. The pending bill would not benefit these industries nor the people they employ and support. It would injure them, threaten their domestic and foreign markets and their jobs.

American exports are now running to more than twice the value of imports, but the whole philosophy of this bill is to cut down still further the imports. The bill totally ignores the fact that if Ameri-

can producers are to be paid for the things they are sending abroad it will have to be in the form of imports from abroad. Otherwise it will be a case of giving away our goods. This simple fact does not penetrate the consciousness of the authors of this piece of legislation.

The high-tariff apostles have forgotten, if they ever understood, what happened under the Smoot-Hawley tariff policy, but they want to go back to that policy. They have steadfastly refused to face the fact that the reciprocal trade-agreements program is an effective means of getting away from the conditions into which we were plunged by the 1930 tariff act. For the sake of a few, at the cost of the many, they want now to kill the trade-agreements program. If this bill becomes a law, they will have succeeded.

The first provision in H. R. 6556 purports to extend the authority of the President for negotiating trade agreements by 1 year only instead of for the 3 years which have become customary. The framers of this bill put in that provision simply because they were well aware that in 1 year it would be almost impossible to gather the data, make the investigations, and carry out the negotiations involved in a trade agreement of any importance. They know that under past procedure most agreements required a full year or more to formulate and negotiate.

But to make sure of their objective, they have piled up new, cumbersome, and confusing procedures. They have required that the Tariff Commission hold extensive hearings on lists of items on which concessions are to be considered, and that it report to the President how far and for how long he might reduce tariff rates on those items. At the same time the bill specifically prohibits the Tariff Commission from taking part, as it always has, in decisions or negotiations. That prohibition deprives the interdepartmental trade-agreements organization and the President of the highly expert help of the Commission.

In prescribing the hearings and the report which will be required from the Tariff Commission the bill takes no account of any interest in the national economy except those enterprises that are seeking to maintain or increase their tariff protection. Export industries would have no place at these hearings to suggest concessions which might be obtained from foreign countries for the benefit of American trade. All that the Commission could consider and report on is the maximum change in import restrictions which could be made in the agreement. The Commission would have no chance to suggest any tariff cut which it might consider reasonable and desirable. The six other Government agencies in the trade-agreements organization would have no opportunity to question witnesses at the Tariff Commission hearings or hear the reasons they might offer for opposing tariff reductions. The Tariff Commission alone, instead of the seven executive agencies which now participate in formulating the agreements, would have to take the whole brunt of the tariff-lobby attacks. High protectionists would like this opportunity to press for their own advantage, but the general welfare of the country would suffer.

The Committee on Reciprocity Information, representing all the trade-agreement agencies, holds public hearings that implement the requirement in the Trade Agreements Act to give full opportunity for any interested person—consumer, exporter, importer, or producer—to give his views on a proposed agreement. In providing for separate hearings by the Tariff Commission, H. R. 6556 would duplicate in large part the CRI hearings. Thus it would double the burden and confusion of businessmen and others who wished to offer their views on a given agreement.

Section 5 of the pending bill is a revealing and an important example of the direction in which the authors of the bill would like to go. It provides that a tariff could be increased in a trade agreement to as high as one and one-half times the 1930 Smoot-Hawley rate. On the other hand, a tariff reduction cannot be more than 50 percent of the rate in effect on January 1, 1945. It would be possible, under these provisions, for some existing tariff rates to be raised by 500 percent, to six times what they are now. The only purpose of pointing out these facts is to show where the wishful thinking of the authors of the bill would lead them.

If all this were not enough to show this up as a high-tariff bill and nothing else, that old and threadbare proposal of the congressional veto is dragged in again. This congressional veto proposal is deliberately intended to be the straw to break the camel's back when it is piled on top of the 1-year extension, the Tariff Commission veto power, and the new and awkward procedures. Opponents of the trade-agreements program want to kill it and any other program for reduction of barriers to international trade. If one device does not do the job they hope another one will.

The Tariff Commission is an executive agency, its members appointed by the President. Under the provisions of the pending bill the President, if he decided, in the national interest, not to accept the recommendations of his own appointees, would have to let Congress decide between him and them. That is not good administration nor good government.

It is doubtful whether any trade agreement containing substantial concessions, once laid before the Congress, could be put into effect. But there is no doubt about what would happen here the moment the agreement reached Congress. The instant result would be a swarm of special-interest lobbyists descending on Congress and an avalanche of demands that the agreement be turned down. The old logrolling and tariff bickering would move back into the capitol.

There is far more at stake in this bill than the reciprocal trade-agreements program. This Congress has authorized the pouring of billions of dollars into the European recovery program. The ERP legislation requires the countries which share in American assistance to lower their barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries. But H. R. 6556 would make it difficult if not impossible for the United States itself to do the very thing which it demands that the European countries do. Unless ERP money is to be poured down a rat hole, sound commercial trade in Europe and with this country must be restored and expanded. A workable trade-agreements program will bring this about and thereby make it possible for us to be repaid, in part at least, for what we are sending to Europe. H. R. 6556 does not provide for any such program. The policy and philosophy behind H. R. 6556 would make expansion of world trade impossible.

This bill is not a bill to extend the reciprocal trade-agreements program as a continuing means of sound international cooperation toward expanding sound world trade through reduction of trade barriers. It is a sham and a repudiation of our economic foreign policy which will cost us dear.

Foreign countries are watching to see what we do. Only by a genuine and effective extension of the reciprocal trade-agreements program for a full 3-year term, without these amendments in H. R. 6556 which so obviously render it unworkable, can we retain their confidence and cooperation in a policy which, for 14 years, has served us well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has expired.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I am very fond of my good friend, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. I do not agree with him today; however, our personal relations are such that we can honestly disagree without being disagreeable. Former tariff debates, between those who believe in a protective tariff and free-traders, have no place in this argument.

The so-called Reciprocal Trade Act has been in force for approximately 14 years. This legislation in no way attempts to destroy or repeal that act. When this act was placed on the statute books our Government embarked upon an unknown sea. We had no landmarks, bell buoys, or fog signals placed to guide our course. The administration was given carte blanche authority with very few limitations to enter into these agreements. The whole thing in the beginning was an experiment and only proposed as such. Its proponents did not ask for permanency but only a period of trial. On different occasions the trial period has been extended, the last time in 1943. I voted for that extension.

True, world conditions have been abnormal. Ordinary economic policies have not prevailed. Things have been unsettled and unstable and the necessities of war have controlled not only in this country but in every nation on earth. The present trade agreement law will expire on June 12 next and, unless some action is taken by the Congress, all trade

agreement authority will cease. Personally, I do not want that to happen.

I realize that the House is divided into three groups: First, the free-traders who would wipe out all legislation involving any protective tariff principle. Mr. Chairman, I believe there are few in this group at the moment.

Second, there is the group that would return to the highest protective tariff ever prevailing in this country. This group is negligible.

In between there are those who realize that our country cannot always sell and never buy from our competitors. We want international trade but we do not want this trade badly enough to give any political group authority to destroy American industry for the express purpose of developing temporary commerce with other nations. I am confident that a majority of our Membership belongs to this third group. Let us keep the good provisions of this act and improve the law.

Mr. Chairman, there are not enough votes in the Congress to continue the present authority of the Executive to make these agreements without further limitation, and by the same token there are not enough votes in the Congress to repeal the present law. In short, unless there is some compromise there will be no extension of this act. A vote against any change is a vote to kill the law. It would therefore, seem to me that common sense dictates the early adoption of the pending bill—admittedly a compromise, yet a wholesome and a safe one.

The real change proposed, is in the administrative machinery provided. This has been fully and adequately explained by members of the Ways and Means Committee. To me the really fundamental change is the elimination of the Committee of Reciprocity Information and the transfer of the functions performed by that committee to the Tariff Commission.

The CRI is a political group operating within the executive departments, the committee members being named by the Executive or the heads of the respective executive departments, without confirmation by the Senate and, in fact, without public notice. They may be purely political appointments. A Republican administration, happening to be in favor of high tariffs, might have one group of political negotiators, while a Democratic administration, opposed to all protective tariffs, would have another type of politicians.

Now, on the other hand, the Tariff Commission is an established agency and has the respect and confidence of the people of the Nation. Created by law a number of years ago, it is nonpartisan or entirely bipartisan. The members of the Commission are named by the President and confirmed by the Senate. There must be three Democrats and three Republicans on the Commission. This is a scientific group and has never been accused of being politically partisan. We all have faith in the findings of the Tariff Commission. Now, if this is true, then why should there be objection to having these proposed agreements investigated by the Tariff Commission and approved or disapproved rather than by the purely political Committee on Reciprocity Information? To me there is but one logical answer. The report of the Commitee on Ways and Means gives in parallel columns the exact changes made in the present act by the pending bill. This illustration should be most helpful and is as follows:

OPERATION UNDER PRESENT METHOD	OPERATION UNDER PROPOSED METHOD
1. State Department announces intention to negotiate an agreement and the items to be considered.	1. No change.
2. CRI, established by Executive order, composed of representatives of interested executive departments, announces hearings.	2. President transmits list of items to Tariff Commission and directs that agency to make a study of each item. Tariff Commission announces hearings.
3. Hearings before CRI.	3. Hearings before the Tariff Commission.
4. Trade agreements (interdepartmental). Committee formed by Executive order considers evidence, item by item, and reports to the President.	4. Tariff Commission considers evidence and transmits report of findings to the President. No Tariff Commission members to be on Trade Agreements Committee, but Commission required to cooperate fully throughout negotiations.
5. President approves or modifies Trade Agreements Committee recommendations.	5. President approves or modifies Tariff Commission recommendations.
6. Negotiations by State Department.	6. No change.
7. Agreement signed.	7. No change.
8. President proclaims new rates.	8. If the rates in the tentative agreement fall within the competitive area found by the Tariff Commission, the President may immediately proclaim them. If the Tariff Commission report is not followed, then the President may not proclaim the new rates until Congress has had opportunity, within 60 days, to object by concurrent resolution.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy for the demagogue to shout "crippling amendments." Those amendments are not crippling. They are strengthening and perfecting instead.

We live in a new era so far as tariffs and export and import duties are concerned, and we might as well face the realities as they are. I am satisfied that our country could not have attained its present dominant place in the world, with the highest standard of living of any people on earth, without our protective tariffs during the development of our industries and our country. These aids and safeguards should not be scrapped. Amendments and changes should be made where conditions and times warrant. Is there anyone here who takes issue with this statement? Of course not.

Carping criticism and political maneuvering have no place in this debate. I do not think that reciprocal trade agreements made under existing law or the proposed law will be very vital during the life of the European recovery program. That law gives the President much authority so far as exports and imports are concerned. That law will be subject to reappraisal on June 30, 1949. Reason and logic convince me that it will be sensible to extend the act we are now discussing so that it will expire about the same time. In the interim, there will either be a stabilization of world economic conditions or we will be in war, and reciprocal trade agreements, peacetime relief, recovery efforts, and all of that, will be subjugated to the necessities of war.

In short, I am persuaded that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be extended in some form for a limited period and this bill, which will pass the House today, is the best solution of a difficult problem. We must all give and take. As I have so often said on the floor of the House, we would have had no Constitution if the framers had resorted to petty personal differences and sought political advantage rather than the best compromise obtainable. As a practical matter, a vote against this bill is a vote to let the present law die on June 12. I do not want that.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill as reported by the committee, and in so doing feel that I am unquestionably acting in the best interests of my country and the world.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the question of the levying of tariffs is the oldest of all our political issues. It has been an issue ever since the Constitution was adopted—yes, it was really an issue before the Constitution was adopted. The question of levying duties was a very vital one even before the Constitution because the different colonies levied duties on imports from the other colonies. The fact that they did levy these duties was a source of considerable discord between and among the colonies and the matter of relieving this situation was one of the principal reasons for the adoption of the Constitution.

When our founding fathers gave us the Constitution, they decided that tariffs and all matters connected therewith should be placed under the control and within the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States. The Constitution says, "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises."

As I have already stated, the levying of tariffs is exclusively a prerogative of Congress. The amount of the tariffs to be levied is a matter within the jurisdiction of Congress. Also the selection of the articles upon which the tariffs are to be levied is left exclusively to Congress. Across the years many a political campaign has been waged on what articles should be subject to

tariffs and what the amounts should be and also what should be done with the money collected. This gave rise to the important issues of "protective tariff" and "tariff for revenue only."

There came a time when the tariff and its ramifications became so important and so widespread that the Republicans took the position many years ago that Congress should delegate some of the details of the collections of tariffs to the Executive Department. The matter of reciprocity in the levying of tariffs was distinctly of Republican origin. In our early history the Democrats were usually always opposed to tariffs and in favor of free trade. So it is rather unusual to find the Democrats and the New Dealers today so anxious with reference to the matter of levying tariffs and import duties.

James G. Blaine and William McKinley were pioneers in introducing reciprocity into the tariffs and trade agreements. The Republican Party always insisted that the right to levy tariffs should be retained by the Congress. When the Republicans were in power reciprocal trade agreements were made but they were subject to final approval by the Congress. The Congress set forth a yardstick by providing limits below which tariffs should not be reduced and above which they should not be raised. During the Republican administrations these limitations were observed and Congress reserved the right to give its approval. The President could only make agreements within certain limitations.

When the New Deal came into power, Mr. Rosevelt and his gang decided that the matter of levying tariffs would be a great advantage to the Executive so they decided to take it over. It was at that time that Cordell Hull came forward with his plan which has become known as Reciprocal Trade Agreements. The only new principle involved in his plan was that he, having always been a free trader, was ready and willing to take away from Congress the function of collecting tariffs. He and Mr. Roosevelt decided that they would do this job themselves. They would do it by the appointment of what they now call a Committee on Reciprocity Information. They decided that the matter of levying tariffs would become a function of the State Department. It has become a function of the State Department. Everything that has been done in the last 12 or 14 years with reference to tariffs has been done by the State Department. The Committee on Reciprocity Information is in effect a travesty. There is no justification for it from a constitutional basis nor from an economical basis. Its only justification is that it is an arm of the Executive and does exactly what the State Department wants it to do. I challenge any one to show where the Committee on Reciprocity Information has ever done anything with the idea in mind of serving the public or where it ever has done anything of its own initiative or where it has ever done anything except what the State Department desired that it should do. One striking fact proves my statement. For instance, the Committee on Reciprocity Information is not a continuing committee—no one knows its personnel from day to day. No person who ever appeared before it was given any report or any decision of any kind. The personnel of this committee was made up at the whim of the Secretary of State. The membership served at his appointment and no doubt were advised as to what they were expected to do and what decisions they were expected to make.

Mr. Chairman, I have always felt that this situation was strange enough to be ludicrous but when I contemplate the power that these functionaries have had, I consider the situation to be more than ludicrous. It is simply awful. When we stop to think that this constitutional function is footballed around in this fashion then we can see why we ought to come back to the Constitution. I fail to see why anyone would hesitate a minute in his desire to get rid of these bureaucrats and put in their places the regularly constituted Tariff Commission which has always been a highly respected body. Ever since Roosevelt and Hull took over, the jurisdiction of the Tariff Commission has been practically nullified.

To my mind the Tariff Commission is immeasurably preferable to this uncertain unauthorized Committee on Reciprocity Information.

I am sorry I do not have time to go further into this matter. I wish to take up another matter where the New Dealers have deceived the public shamefully. I refer to their failure to give aggrieved parties a chance for their day in court. It is a great American principle of law that every wrong has a remedy. Through all of the tariff laws there runs the right of innocent parties to present their grievances. They have had a right to be heard. Under the present practices they are given the right to be heard but they are never given a decision. Countless persons and corporations have presented their views and their grievances but they are never given a report as to why their grievances have not been considered. The New Dealers have in effect represented to the country that all parties have a right for their day in court but the fact remains that not for a number of years has any aggrieved party been able to get his grievance considered by any court anywhere. In other words, as a part of this free trade New Deal program the Chief Executive and the State Department have seen to it that the matter of fixing tariffs is altogether within the power and province of the Chief Executive and the State Department and that their decision is final in every respect and that no one, regardless of how he has been mistreated, can find his way into any court anywhere.

Therefore I say that in practical effect none of the thousands of aggrieved persons who have felt that injustices have been perpetrated upon them, have been able to get any redress in any court. In this result the Chief Executive and the Secretary of State have also invaded the jurisdiction of the courts. A complete dictatorship has been established under the New Deal in its handling of the matter of levying tariff duties.

The Geneva Conference was an invasion of the rights of the Congress by the Executive. Apparently, no good has ever come of the Geneva Conference which cost our country many millions. The conference at Habana, Cuba, during the early months of this year was practically another invasion of the rights of Congress by the Executive.

So I repeat that the present legislation which we are now considering will do away with this autocratic assumption of power by the Executive and will bring back to Congress some of the rights which the Constitution reposed in it.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. Does the gentleman believe that this legislation which has been proposed here today will in anywise restore to the Congress the right to write a tariff bill?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes, it will, and I will just take time to explain that a little. For instance, at the present time the law provides a sliding scale beyond and below which the President cannot go. We fixed a yardstick, as it were. If we pass the pending bill it will bring us back to that particular yardstick, it will absolutely fix a yardstick beyond which the President cannot go either up or down, and if he seeks to go up or down beyond the yardstick fixed by the Tariff Commission then he must come back to Congress for approval.

I am glad the gentleman asked that question because it proves my point exactly, and that is that this law does bring it back to Congress and I challenge anybody to show in the last 14 years where the Congress has had anything to do with these matters. The Executive has taken charge.

Mr. LYNCH. And if Congress does not act, the same situation prevails.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Exactly.

Mr. LYNCH. The President writes the reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Exactly. He enters into the agreements through his assistants and if he complies with the law then the agreement is made.

Mr. LYNCH. So that insofar as the gentleman's argument is concerned, the bill does not eliminate the evil he says exists.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It does eliminate it, completely, and brings the President's proposed agreements back to the Congress so that the Congress, if he has attempted to go beyond what Congress by law has fixed as a limit, can say: "You cannot go higher, you cannot go lower." The Republican viewpoint is that Congress has full control over tariffs and that when Congress has set a limit within which the President can act, that when he goes beyond that limit it comes back to Congress for action. Nothing has come back to Congress for acceptance since the Roosevelt days.

In my section of the country the manufacturers of pottery, glassware, and china have suffered by reason of these free-trade and unfair and unjust practices. When a New Dealer blatantly proclaims that no industry has ever suffered by reason of the injustices of the reciprocal-trade agreements as carried out by the Roosevelt administration, we need but to inquire of the manufacturers

of these commodities. The owners of these industries are loud in their condemnation of these practices and likewise the employees of these industries, who have repeatedly appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to make their protests. In this period of inflation and high prices, the dangers of these reciprocal trade agreements are not easily discerned. Let the time come when production falls off again and the foreign countries have been rehabilitated so that they have regained their place as producers, then we will find that we must protect ourselves against foreign importations by the levying of protective tariffs.

I leave off as I began—that the levying of tariffs is a function of the Congress and that I shall be glad to see the day come again when Congress will be able to exercise its constitutional functions.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, not being a member of the Ways and Means Committee I naturally knew very little about this bill until the report came out and the bill came on the floor. I am one of those Members who would certainly not vote for this measure if he believed all of the catastrophic predictions made by members of the minority. If this bill should effectively destroy the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act I should not be able to vote for it. The assurances of the distinguished sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], and his colleagues, of course, have sufficiently convinced me that this is not so.

It is not necessary, however, for any Member to rely solely upon the assertion of the majority sponsors of the bill. Fortunately, a minority report was written. The minority report is more convincing, if anything could be, than even the majority statements, of the phoniness, the utter and complete phoniness of the attacks made on the floor upon this bill by the minority Members. If you will examine the report you will find that the primary reason assigned by the minority for their opposition is the intervention of the Tariff Commission. And they are opposed to that, why? Because the Commission would be required "to analyze all of the available facts and arrive at a judgment based upon such facts and on assumptions regarding such imponderables, price levels, and so forth, in the United States," precisely what the State Department is trying to do or pretending to do at the present time.

Then to cap the climax the minority report very fortunately calls our attention to the fact that the President has already brought the Tariff Commission into this procedure by the Executive order of February 1947. But the trouble with the way the President brought it in is that he has put the cart before the horse. He has put it in in such a way as to attempt to close the stable door after the horse has fled. In other words, under the Executive order, the minority report recalls, an escape clause is to be included in the reciprocal trade treaties and concessions may be withdrawn if serious injury is threatened to or done to an American industry, and the Tariff Commission is set up as the agency to investigate, to report and to recommend to the President what remedial action is to be taken to cure that injury.

Mr. Chairman, all this bill does is to put the horse before the cart where it belongs. It authorizes and directs the Tariff Commission to make that investigation before serious injury is done, not afterward.

I am satisfied that this bill is sound, that no injury is done to American foreign trade, and that the apprehensions aroused by the intemperate attacks of the minority are without foundation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill. I believe it is wise and sound legislation. My only regret is that we are considering it under gag rule.

I find myself in a peculiar position on this matter. I believe that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has brought out from his subcommittee a good bill, and that free debate and full consideration of amendments would demonstrate to the Congress and to the country its fundamental soundness. On the other hand, the leadership of the Ways and Means Committee saw fit to insist upon a gag rule, which is considered by the press and public as a confession of weakness. For myself, I have never been able to understand the psychology of a committee leadership which asks the House to consider a bill, but not to consider amendments to it. I have never been able to decide whether this is caused by an inferiority complex based on a fear that the committee cannot defend its bill or a superiority complex based on the assumption that the committee is wiser than the rest of the House. In the present instance, when for the first time in the many extensions of the Reciprocal Trade Extension Agreements Act a closed rule has been demanded, the result is to injure the prospects of final approval of a good bill by giving the impression that the closed rule was demanded to bolster up a bad bill.

I could not vote for such a rule, but I urge support of this good bill on its merits, in spite of the unfortunate circumstances surrounding its consideration. The most unfortunate of these circumstances is not the rule, but the all-or-nothing demand of Secretary Marshall as reported in the press. Let me remind the House that action on this bill will have world-wide significance, but that significance will depend ultimately upon what the bill provides, not what someone says about it, or the procedure by which it becomes law. Earlier this year the papers carried a somewhat similar all-or-nothing demand by Secretary Marshall in connection with the economic-aid bill. Congress turned down his demand and gave him neither all nor nothing, but the whole world has acclaimed the bill which Congress finally passed with the President's approval.

The present bill continues the authority of the President to make trade agreements with other countries, through the use of the Tariff Commission, a bipartisan, independent, public agency instead of the Committee on Reciprocal Information, a partisan, secret agency controlled by the President. The agreements go into effect unless there has been an independent, bipartisan determination that they cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles or impair the national defense. Even under such circumstances, the agreements go into effect unless both Houses of Congress within 60 days by a majority vote veto such agreements.

This 60-day review procedure follows precisely the Reorganization Act procedure, which had the support of the minority floor leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and many others who are now opposing it when it is to be applied to agreements of the President which may have more far-reaching effects on our country than any change in Government agencies. I proposed this same procedure for reciprocal trade extension in 1943 and my amendment was defeated by a partisan vote. Under the circumstances, the objections to review of these agreements by the bipartisan Tariff Commission and by the Democrat-sponsored limited congressional review procedure can only be based upon partisanship of a misunderstanding of what is involved.

The tariff as a means of controlling foreign trade has little meaning in these days of export-import controls, distorted currencies, embargoes and subsidies. Extension of the reciprocal-trade law will, however, be considered as a symbol of our intention to continue to participate in the adjustment of trade regulations consistent with maximum beneficial foreign trade. After the sound and fury of debate in Congress, and editorial and radio comment outside have subsided, other countries will study the terms of the extension to determine its significance as a symbol. I want these countries to see:

First. That our country intends a bipartisan, independent determination of the economic facts involved.

Second. A review of the agreements, in case of controversy, by the elected representatives of the people, as is now the case in the overwhelming majority of the other countries with which we have trade agreements. By passing this bill we will tell the world one fact of life about our Republic: that our international cooperation depends not alone upon the President, but upon the continued cooperation of the President with Congress in protecting our own economy and our national security.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, if the issues were as simple as they appear to be after listening to some of my Republican

colleagues, I perhaps would not be speaking; certainly I would not be concerned about the Gearhart bill, H. R. 6556.

The issue here is not whether the program initiated by Mr. Cordell Hull will be continued for 1 year or whether it shall be continued for a longer period of time. The issue here is whether or not we shall for any period of time continue the reciprocal trade agreements program or depart upon a new, entirely different program through which we hope to initiate some economic agreements with countries abroad.

The gentleman from California, chairman of the subcommittee, along with the other five ranking Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, have not, in my opinion, become converted since 1945 to the Hull reciprocal trade agreements program. I see some of them on the floor. If I am incorrect, I will be glad to yield for a correction. It is my understanding that none of the six top ranking Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee has ever voted for the Hull reciprocal trade agreements program. Is it not logical to assume then, Mr. Chairman, that this which they bring to us today in the guise of the Hull program is something entirely different, else they would not be supporting it?

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, in 1943, in the middle of the war, was the only time any of the Republican leaders in the House voted to extend it, and the gentleman's statement is correct. On that occasion the only Members of the Republican leadership who voted for it were the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], now Speaker, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] now the majority leader. They voted against it every other time, and the gentleman's statement in every other respect is absolutely correct.

Mr. MILLS. I thank the gentleman. Of course, when I read the bill—though not a member of the subcommittee, but when it was referred to the full committee—I began to wonder just a little bit if I could understand the bill from a simple reading of it. It did not appear illogical that they were giving me that which I wanted, and that the only compromise was one between 3 years and 1 year, so I tried to analyze the bill as best I could, and to compare it with procedures under existing law.

Comparison of the present procedure in preparing and negotiating reciprocal trade agreements with that proposed in H. R. 6556, the Gearhart bill now before the House, shows clearly that here is an attempt to trade a well-tested and effective procedure which protects all American citizens in exchange for an unknown, untried, and unworkable scheme which is obviously for the benefit of a comparatively limited number of American producers.

THE ESTABLISHED PROCEDURE

The established procedure in negotiating trade agreements derives in part from specific directives in the act itself; partly from Executive orders, the latest of which are No. 9647 of October 1945 and No. 9832 of February 1947; and partly from experience gained since 1934.

COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

In preparing to negotiate agreements, the main link between the public and the Government officials who are to do the actual negotiating, is the Committee for Reciprocity Information, an interdepartmental committee set up by Executive order. This Committee's membership is substantially the same as that of the Committee on Trade Agreements. It was created to carry out the requirement in the Trade Agreements Act that after reasonable public notice of intention to negotiate an agreement has been given, any interested person must have an opportunity to present his views on the agreement.

Through the present process all interested parties, and I want to emphasize all—exporters, importers, producers, consumers, and others with an interest in the proposed agreement—have opportunity to submit information and views. Summaries of the hearings, all briefs and digests of briefs or of correspondence, and correspondence itself when appropriate, are transmitted by the Committee for Reciprocity Information to all interested governmental agencies and officers.

Written statements were received from some 1,000 individuals, firms, and organizations before the opening of the recent Geneva negotiations, and nearly 700 persons appeared at the public hearings before those negotiations.

Under this procedure American producers and consumers have just as ample opportunity to be heard as they have before a congressional committee.

H. R. 6556, the Gearhart bill, makes no provision for any such hearings or collection of views and information. Of course, it does not prohibit them. If they are to be continued and all segments of the national economy are to have an opportunity to be heard, the Gearhart bill demands a costly, cumbersome, and burdensome duplication of procedure.

What does the bill really do? The bill permits the President to negotiate agreements that may reduce the rate of tariff which we maintain in return for reductions abroad after certain things have occurred. What are those things? First of all, the Tariff Commission must conduct a hearing at which everybody who is interested in the question of the tariff being raised or lowered, if he has an industry being protected, may appear, give testimony, and be heard. The sole purpose of the investigations and hearings provided for in the bill now before us is to determine the margin of protection which must be maintained for the benefit of certain domestic producers who fear foreign competition. There is no place in those hearings for consumers or industries who are burdened with excessive costs because of excessive tariffs. There is no place there for American exporters who wish to ask for concessions which will enlarge their foreign markets. These American economic groups are far more numerous and more important than those who are interested solely in tariff protection for themselves.

The Tariff Commission is made up of six individuals; three Democrats and three Republicans.

The only conclusions reached by the Tariff Commission after its hearings under H. R. 6556 would relate to—I quote:

> (1) the extent to which duties and other import restrictions on the articles included in the list may be modified; or (2) the extent to which additional import restrictions on the articles included in the list may be imposed; or (3) the maximum periods (if any) for which obligations may be undertaken to continue existing customs or excise treatment of articles included in the list.

It is most noteworthy that the Tariff Commission, under the pending bill, is given no voice whatever, such as it now has, in selecting the articles to be placed on the list which is subject to negotiation.

One result of this arrangement would be that a domestic producer wishing to register opposition to a certain tariff concession would have to make duplicate presentations of his case before the Tariff Commission in connection with its report to the President, and to the Committee for Reciprocity Information in connection with the negotiations. Businessmen have frequently complained about the burden of presenting their cases to the Committee for Reciprocity Information. For many of them, H. R. 6556 would simply double this burden.

Under existing procedure the Tariff Commission participates fully in hearing and considering the views of importers, exporters, consumers, and other parties at interest. In fact, the Committee for Reciprocity Information is headed by the vice chairman of the Tariff Commission. Under the proposed bill the Tariff Commission would be strictly debarred from participating in any decision on any matter other than the maximum reduction in tariff which might be made on articles in a list which the Commission has had no hand in preparing.

The six other agencies represented on the present Committee for Reciprocity Information would have no opportunity to examine witnesses giving views and information before the Tariff Commission. All they would get from the Tariff Commission hearings would be an iron curtain, beyond which they could not go. That, of course, would please many enemies of the trade-agreements program.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL TRADE AGREEMENTS COMMITTEE

Under the Trade Agreements Act, the President, before concluding an agreement, must seek advice from the Tariff Commission, the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, the National Military Establishment, and such other sources as he may deem appropriate. Under an Executive order of February 25, 1947, this advice is obtained through an interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements consisting of representatives of agencies named in the act and also representatives of the Treasury and Labor Departments.

The Committee on Trade Agreements directs all necessary trade and commodity studies, reviews the reports and

recommendations of its numerous subcommittees, and submits to the President its recommendations regarding the provisions of the trade agreement of which negotiation is contemplated. The most important of the subcommittees of the Trade Agreements Committee are the country committees set up for each country with which an agreement is contemplated. The country committees are made up of experts from the United States Government agencies represented on the Trade Agreements Committee. From time to time special subcommittees on special problems may be set up by the Committee on Trade Agreements.

Under the Gearhart bill the role of the Tariff Commission in this preparatory work would be sharply curtailed. The Commission would be explicitly prohibited from doing anything on country or other committees except to answer questions. The expert advice of the Tariff Commission members in directing studies and assisting the rest of the trade-agreements organization in reaching sound decisions would no longer be available to either country committees or the Trade Agreements Committee itself. The Tariff Commission would have no voice in recommending to the President what should be done—only what should not be done—a purely negative function.

Such an arrangement is cumbersome and it makes possible a complete deadlock. The President could act only after he had had the report from the Tariff Commission.

The President can enter into no negotiations with any country for the purpose of reducing tariffs until a peril point for each article has been established by the Tariff Commission. It is not a question of going below or staying above the peril point, but under the bill itself he has no authority to attempt to negotiate until the Tariff Commission has reached a decision as to the peril point. Where would the President be with a divided Commission—three on one side and three on the other—or with six separate recommendations from each of six Commissioners? Obviously, he could do nothing, which is the clear desire of the opponents of the trade-agreements program and the true aim of this bill.

Now, remember, Mr. Chairman, that every one of these trade agreements contemplates many, many articles; hundreds of articles, if you please. It is not a question of negotiating in regard to one tariff rate. It is a question of deliberating in regard to any number of tariff rates; six men, three Democrats and three Republicans. Certainly, it is conceivable that in regard to the articles proposed to be contained in a trade agreement that the Tariff Commission would not be able to get together on what the peril point is regarding one of those articles.

If the Tariff Commission could not get together on 1 of them, even though they could get together on 999, the President could not include that article in his negotiations; either that or he would have to drop the entire negotiations.

First of all, then, there must be the establishment of a peril point. How do you think the members of the Tariff Commission would arrive at a conclusion concerning the peril point? I will tell you how they would do it. The important factor in arriving at a peril point would be the consideration of cost of production in the United States versus the cost of production abroad, yet on a cursory reading of the bill you do not find the fact that now the sponsors of this bill have injected into it the very thing the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has always advocated, that is, cost of production in the United States versus cost of production abroad.

Mr. GEARHART. If the gentleman will yield, of course when he says I have advocated cost of production all the time it is his assertion, because I do not do that.

Mr. MILLS. If I have misstated the gentleman, I am sorry. I certainly understood the gentleman in the committee on numerous occasions to favor cost of production as a criterion.

Mr. GEARHART. I fear the gentleman has confused me with somebody else.

Mr. MILLS. I will withdraw that, then.

Mr. GEARHART. A point I should like to comment on and have the gentleman's further comment on is this. The gentleman stated it would take the Tariff Commission an unreasonable length of time to do the thing the bill would require. May I inquire of the gentleman how that same operation is handled under the present system?

Mr. MILLS. Under the present system it is not necessary to determine cost of production in the United States versus cost of production abroad. I would suggest to the gentleman, since he is the author of the bill, that he had better reread it, because the Tariff Commission cannot determine peril points, points below which tariffs cannot be reduced, without knowing something about the cost of production in the United States versus cost of production abroad. I know that during the consideration of this measure, since I have been in the Congress, that has been one of the proposals that those belonging to the gentleman's party have advocated in the past. If that becomes the law, if it is necessary for that to be determined before the peril point can be determined, the gentleman knows there could not be a reciprocal trade agreement entered into if this act should be extended 3 years, let alone 1 year. The procedure is entirely changed.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I came in just a moment ago, in time to hear the gentleman's last statement. I want to be put right, that is all. Is it the gentleman's contention that those negotiating the reciprocal trade agreements should under no conditions consider the cost of production of similar articles in the United States and in the country with which we are negotiating?

Mr. MILLS. If my good friend from Michigan understood me to say that, I hasten to say that he misunderstood me entirely, because that is not the point I was making. Certainly the cost of producing an item in the United States is considered as best it can be considered on the basis of information available to the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Trade Agreements Committee, but there is no scientific method of determining such costs for the purpose of establishing the peril point, as this bill attempts to do. This makes a science of determining the cost of production and the peril point, which I say cannot be done on the basis of the staff that the Tariff Commission now has or with a staff double or triple the one the Commission has.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

ACTUAL INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, after the President has approved the recommendations of the Trade Agreements Committee regarding the provisions of the proposed agreement, actual negotiations, on a product-by-product basis, are begun with representatives of the other country or countries. In these negotiations, the United States under existing arrangements is represented by officers of all the various agencies, including the Tariff Commission, represented in the Committee on Trade Agreements and its subcommittees under the leadership of Department of State officers. These negotiators can offer concessions only within the limits which have been approved by the President and only in exchange for concessions of comparable value by other countries. Before they can agree to additional offers in the course of negotiations, these changes must be studied and recommended by the interdepartmental committee and approved by the President.

Among the shrewdest bargainers and most skillful negotiators on the American side in the past have been the representatives of the Tariff Commission. This bill shuts them out of the negotiations entirely. They are not allowed, under this bill, to sit at the table with the negotiators of foreign countries. They are not allowed to give the representatives of the other Government agencies the benefit of their knowledge. They have been required to say, in advance, "thus far shalt thou go and no farther." They are not allowed even to suggest that a little more relaxation here or a little more firmness there is permissible. Without them at the negotiating table the representatives of the six other national agencies will be most severely handicapped.

This bill, on the surface, purports to give greater effectiveness to the participation of the Tariff Commission in the trade-agreements program. Actually, it does nothing but circumscribe and limit the usefulness of that body. Presumably, the idea is that the Tariff Commission will be subservient to the political will of a new administration which the proponents of the bill hope will be of a different political complexion. That has not been the record of the Tariff Commission in past years. As a bipartisan body, it has borne a splendid and objective part in carrying out a sound and effective program of tariff reform for 14 years. So

far as the cramping limitations of this bill permit, it may be expected to continue to do so in the future.

SAFEGUARDING CLAUSES

Experience under the Trade Agreements Act has shown that agreements seldom, if ever, threaten serious injury to domestic producers of goods on which import duties have been modified. If any such case should arise, however, the means for adjustment are readily available. Under Executive Order 9832 of February 1947 every future trade agreement must include a comprehensive safeguarding clause like that first included in the 1942 trade agreement with Mexico. This clause provided that if, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concession granted by the United States on any article, that article is imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like articles, the United States shall be free to withdraw the concession or to modify it as may be necessary.

The Executive order requires that the Tariff Commission is to make investigations to determine whether invocation of the clause is justified. Such investigation is to be undertaken either upon request of the President, upon motion of the Tariff Commission, or upon application of any interested party when in the Commission's judgment there is good and sufficient reason therefor. Public hearings are to be held in connection with these investigations, and the recommendations of the Commission are to be presented to the President for his consideration, decision, and action in the light of the public interest.

It should be emphasized that this escape clause is not a statutory provision. It is a safeguard which the executive branch of the Government has found desirable. It should likewise be emphasized that no such provision is contained in H. R. 6556, the Gearhart bill, which wholly omits any such provision or requirement. The pending bill, in other words, leaves domestic industry wholly bare of the effective emergency protective measure which is, by existing Executive order, included in every trade agreement which can be made under present procedure. Under this escape clause, now required by Executive order, the United States can modify or withdraw a tariff concession which, through unforeseen circumstances, may jeopardize an American industry. Under this pending bill the Tariff Commission must guess, in advance, what the consequences might be. Under the bill there is complete rigidity—no opportunity to reconsider. It is easily understandable that under such circumstances the Commission may be far more than conservative in setting the limits beyond which tariff concessions may not go.

Various means of reviewing agreements have been developed in order to make sure that the agreements liberalize trade conditions and promote an increased exchange of goods without serious injury to domestic industry. The Executive order of February 1947, requires that the Tariff Commission make an annual report to the President and Congress on the operation of the trade-agreements program. In addition, the Commission is required by the order to keep informed at all times concerning the operation and effect of trade-agreement provisions relating to import restrictions of the United States. Other interested agencies, too, including the National Military Establishment and the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, State, Labor, and the Treasury, constantly watch over developments at home and abroad as they affect our trade. Our Foreign Service officers report currently all actions by foreign governments and developments in foreign countries affecting trade agreements. Finally, the Committee for Reciprocity Information at all times receives and circulates to the entire trade-agreements organizations the trade-agreement problems reported by interested persons.

The late Dr. Thomas Walker Page, long-time Tariff Commissioner and outstanding tariff authority of the United States, said of the preparation for trade agreements:

> In the preparation of the trade agreements, there has been less secrecy and there has been more opportunity for interested parties to present their views than there has been in any tariff revision for more than a hundred years.

I wish to quote also from Mr. William L. Monro, former president of the American Tariff League, which has consistently opposed the trade-agreements program from its inception:

> I will also stress the fact that in carrying out the trade-agreement policy by Mr. Hull, great credit should be given to the fact there has been no suspicion of political influence regarding the reduction in duties on any article placed on the reciprocal trading list. I believe that everyone who has had occasion to contact the staff that makes up the schedules must admit that regardless of whether we approve of the policy or not, the agreements are prepared solely from the viewpoint of endeavoring to increase foreign trade with the least injury to domestic industries.

Why should it now be proposed that this effective machinery be scrapped for a will-o'-the-wisp conjured up for political reasons?

The Gearhart bill says that if the President, having in mind the general public welfare, decides that tariff concessions exceeding those laid down by the Tariff Commission as the maximum permissible are desirable, and concludes a trade agreement embodying such concessions, he shall lay the agreement before the Congress subject to congressional veto within 60 days. Since every agreement will presumably be before Congress, we will return to the Republican logrolling tariff policy, under the bill.

There is a far longer range and far more widespread reaction. If the United States today repudiates its stand in favor of a more liberalized and expanded world trade; if it shows its hesitancy and indecision by renewing the Trade Agreements Act for only 1 year instead of the customary 3; if it hedges its actions by quibbling, crippling, and obviously isolationist acts such as the pending Gearhart bill, the United States will lose the confidence of the world in its good faith, in the sincerity of its protestations about expanding world trade. It will have abandoned its international leadership toward a world of better living standards, of prosperity, and of peace.

Western Europe recently received hope of further economic cooperation from us when we passed ERP. Shall we now destroy that hope by admitting our return to economic isolationism? I trust we will say by our vote that further economic cooperation is to occur, that we are now prepared to open the way for greater world prosperity and understanding, higher standards of living for all, and the complete elimination of some of the causes of war. Your support of the motion to recommit means this.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, if this cannot be done promptly by the Tariff Commission, as the bill would require it to act, then I ask, by whom are these studies being made now? If it is not done by any agency of the Government at the moment, then it must be taken as admitted that our tariffs are being slashed blindly, unscientifically, and without any idea as to the highly technical matters they are dealing with.

The gentleman has focused our attention upon the most flagrant weakness of the present system—a reckless, unscientific, nontechnical dealing with a complicated problem which requires the most expert technical understanding to comprehend.

The thousands of unemployed shoemakers of Massachusetts, those who now walk the streets looking for work because of the unequal competition of the Czechoslovakians, can attribute their unhappy situation entirely to the unscientific, nontechnical knowledge of those who slashed the tariff on shoes without consideration of the effect of their reckless disregard of our competitive position. The bill provides in plain words that the Tariff Commission should determine whether or not a business is threatened with injury or whether the national defense capacity of the Nation is impaired. It has nothing to do with and says nothing about the question of cost of production. Upon reflection, I am sure that the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas will agree.

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

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who thoroughly believe in the principles behind the reciprocal trade treaties.

I am one of those who believe that under changed world conditions it is essential to the welfare of the United States that we import much more than we have in the past.

I am one of those who believe that unless we agree to take these imports and fit them in with our economy it will be very difficult to carry out the objectives of the European recovery program.

I am one of those who have always voted for renewal of the reciprocal trade

agreements and have voted against what I considered crippling amendments.

With this background should I, and those who feel as I do, vote for this bill? I believe that we should.

Does this bill in any way cripple the program? The answer is certainly "No." It provides for scientific study by the nonpartisan Tariff Commission in place of hearings by that haphazard group known as the Committee on Reciprocity Information.

The State Department will negotiate as they have in the past, and if they observe the safety limits set by this nonpartisan technical body, whatever changes they have negotiated will go into effect.

It is only if the negotiators exceed these safety limits that the matter has to be presented to Congress. Then the agreement negotiated still goes into effect unless Congress by vote of both Houses within 60 days decides that the treaty which has been made is not to the best interest of the United States.

Certainly there is nothing crippling; nothing which interferes with honest attempts to seek the most advantageous reciprocal agreements in this provision.

Some of the public have been led to believe that the 1 year's extension provided by this bill would mean that agreements already negotiated would expire at the end of 1 year. But of course all Members of Congress know that this is not so.

Those in the administration who have been most closely connected with the program seem to have no great objection to the provisions of this bill except they say: "Can't you make this renewal for 2 years instead of 1?" Let us consider this question for a moment.

It is quite possible that next year we will have a new administration. In order to make this reciprocal trade program a permanent part of our law, would it not be better to have the subject of renewal come before us in the so-called "honeymoon period" of a new administration?

Certainly the whole subject would be considered at that time in a more scientific manner with nothing but the best interest of the country in mind, than it would at a time close to an election when political implications could not fail but to have much weight.

All in all a 1-year renewal now seems to be for the best interest of continuation of true reciprocal trade as our permanent policy.

I believe that leaders of the administration are disappointed in this bill. Disappointed not because it is a bad bill, but because it is such a good bill. They had hoped to have as one of their chief campaign issues what they hoped to call "economic isolation." There is no economic isolation in this bill. The opposition to this good legislation is an attempt by administration followers to make a political issue for their own benefit.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that our friends on my right will forget politics and that many of them will consider this bill on its merits and join with me in voting for it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, if the Democrats were not imbued with a deep feeling of Christian charity, we would without hindrance let you Republicans ride the Smoot-Hawley Act down the road to political perdition. But we are trying to save you. We are trying to bring before your eyes the evils of this bill; and, for the life of me, I cannot understand how you Republicans became converted so rapidly to the idea of reciprocal-trade agreements. Of all those who have spoken in favor of this bill, only one, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], who just preceded me, has ever in his life, except during the war years 1943, voted for reciprocal-trade agreements.

In 1934, just two Republicans voted for reciprocal-trade agreements. In 1937, three Republicans voted for the extension. In 1940, it increased from three to five. In 1943, while the war was going on, there were 145 who placed the welfare of their country above politics. In 1945, there were only 33 Republicans who voted for the extension of the reciprocal-trade agreements.

Now, when I hear you Republicans get up and say how you are now for reciprocity, how you are for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act as set forth in this bill, I am just completely overwhelmed. The change has been so great that I think I might very well read an editorial which appeared in the New York Times this morning, which is entitled "Republican Folly":

REPUBLICAN FOLLY

If the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives had stayed up nights for a month, trying to think up ways of giving the country a stunning exhibition of provincialism and partisanship at their unexampled worst, it could not possibly have hit upon a more successful means of doing so than in the position it has taken on renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, an issue due for a test vote today.

Here, in the Trade Agreements Act, sponsored and developed under the wise statesmanship of Cordell Hull, is the most constructive contribution made by the United States in the last generation to the cause of sound international economics. The Hull program recognizes that international trade, like any other trade, is necessarily a two-way process. It recognizes that we cannot hope to sell abroad unless we buy abroad. It recognizes that a creditor nation (and the United States is the greatest of all creditor nations) cannot expect to be repaid on the loans it makes abroad unless it is willing to accept payment in the only form in which payment can be made in the long run—that is, in terms of goods. It recognizes that the Hull trade program is the indispensable other half of the Marshall plan. It recognizes that the American consumer is entitled, particularly in a time of inflation that is playing hob with living costs, to go to foreign markets for the goods he needs, if these goods are offered to him at more reasonable prices, and that it is an outrage to force him to pay on such goods a tariff which is designed to protect a domestic monopoly. It recognizes that a thriving two-way trade among democratic nations is the best possible assurance of an expanding economy, the soundest possible basis for maintenance of the free enterprise system and the bast possible antidote to endless regimentation and controls of American production.

This is the Hull trade program. Under the powers which Congress thus granted to the administration, 28 mutually beneficial agreements with foreign nations were reached in the first decade of its operation. In the letter and the spirit of the same legislation, more recently, the most ambitious general trade agreement ever to be negotiated was brought to a successful conclusion at Habana by the representatives of no fewer than 53 nations, our own included.

This is the Hull program. It will expire on the 12th of next month unless it is renewed. And what do the Republican House leaders propose to do about it?

They propose to renew it for a single year, but meantime to amend the life out of it. We agree with the pungent comment of Secretary of State Marshall that the Republican bill to be voted upon today carries such crippling amendments that only a shadow of the original act is preserved, while its substance is destroyed. This Republican measure would set up the Tariff Commission, now an integral and smoothly working part of the whole trade-agreement-making process, as a censor over the authority of the President to exercise the powers which have hitherto been delegated to him in this field by Congress. It would make protection a guiding principle of the Commission's action. It would provide that any action of the President which did not conform to the Commission's views could be vetoed by Congress, acting within the next succeeding 60 days—and the 60 days would not mean 60 days merely by the calendar but 60 days of continuous legislative session. This would be the new set-up, and the uncertainties and obstacles resulting from it would heavily, and in many cases fatally, handicap the President in his tariff negotiations with other countries. No foreign country would know whether or not the President's word would stick.

Nor is this all. Having contrived this scheme to knife the Hull trade program while appearing to befriend it, the Republican leaders have brought their plan into the House under a closed rule actually forbidding any attempt whatever to change it on the floor. The House may talk—for a limit of 3 hours. It may vote. But it may vote only for or against this ingenious bit of sabotage. It is either this or nothing. No change permitted. No revision possible. No amendment from the floor. This is gag rule at its worst. In this case the House leaders are making a mockery of the legislative process.

The Senate leaders may have better judgment. They may have a more realistic understanding of what is happening in the world today. They may also have a better guess as to just how many thousands of independent votes this combination of high-tariff provincialism and partisan gag rule will cost the next Republican Presidential candidate if this is to be the program. But the House leaders are set to go. It remains to be seen whether the Senate leaders can ultimately save the party, and the country, from the consequences of this almost incredible folly.

The press of the country is overwhelmingly in favor of the extension of the present act. I understand from the Gallup poll that 80 or 85 percent of the people, who are familiar with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and who have been polled with respect to this particular act, are in favor of the extension of the act as is.

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

Mr. LYNCH. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is my recollection that the Gallup poll showed that two-thirds of those polled stated they did not know anything about it.

Mr. LYNCH. Well, the gentleman and I have been reading two different Gallup polls, because I am quite certain that I am correct in the statement that I have made.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEARHART. I will read a paragraph from the Gallup poll to which the gentleman referred:

> But it may come as a shock to the educators and the national leaders to realize that after 14 years of debate over Cordell Hull's trade-agreement program the vast majority of the voters, 2 out of 3, do not know what the reciprocal trade treaties are.

Mr. LYNCH. That does not contradict in anywise what I have said. Not only do not the vast number of voters know what the reciprocal trade agreements are but after the exhibition of those who have spoken in favor of this bill I am quite convinced that there are a vast number of people on the Republican side who do not know what the reciprocal trade agreements are. What I said was that 80 to 85 percent of those who are familiar with the bill, have indicated that they were in favor of extension, as is.

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

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The percentage it said was of the informed people on the subject.

Mr. LYNCH. That is quite correct.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Moreover, it shows that the vote was 50–50 as between Democrats and Republicans. As many Republicans favored it as Democrats. It was a 50–50 division.

Mr. LYNCH. But if my memory serves me correctly, of the informed people, those who knew about the reciprocal-trade agreements, 80 or 85 percent were for extension.

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

Mr. LYNCH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The uninformed represented probably the old-guard Republicans.

Mr. LYNCH. The other percentage was recorded as not being in favor of reciprocal-trade agreements in the first place. But, Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that when our Republican colleagues say they are in favor of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, when you look back over the record that the Republican Party has established, from the huge number of 2 in 1934, to 33 in 1945, who voted in favor of the reciprocal trade agreements program, I do not think it is quite cricket for you to come here and try to tell the American people that you are in favor of extending the reciprocal trade agreements program.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], who addressed us earlier today, stated likewise that he was for this bill. I would like to know when he was converted. He opposed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1945 and voted against the Reciprocal Trade Extension Act of 1945. When was he converted? When have all you Republicans been converted to the idea of the reciprocal-trade agreements? I know that in your platform you have spoken about it. I know that some of the leaders of your party, like Mr. Stassen, Governor Dewey, and Senator TAFT, have spoken in favor of the extension of the reciprocal-trade agreements, but for some unknown reason the Republican Members of this House have turned their backs upon their party platform, they have turned their backs upon the men who have stood for republicanism in the past, and they are now endeavoring to say they are at this present writing in favor of the reciprocal-trade agreements when you know very well that what you are trying to do is to scuttle the whole act because you know that it is not workable under this bill that has been proposed by our distinguished friend from California.

This bill, H. R. 6556, is objectionable in almost every respect. It gives only lip service to true reciprocity. It is reciprocity in form without substance. Such a proposal is a dagger in the back of real reciprocity. It is a hypocritical device which makes it a meaningless gesture. It proposes to extend a questionable and restrictive authorization for the President for only 1 year; this is insufficient time for gathering data and information to carry through any possible negotiations; the bill serves notice to the rest of the world that the United States has grave doubts about the value of continuing this important economic foreign policy in existence for 14 years. The bill places upon the Tariff Commission, in effect though not in definite terms, the sole responsibility for determining how far a tariff rate may be cut. This follows from the obligation imposed upon the Commission to determine in each case the so-called peril point, below which a cut may not be made. This is a limitation within the present limitation of 50 percent of the rates in effect January 1, 1945.

This procedure will inevitably concentrate upon the Tariff Commission alone the full weight of all of the pressures of special interests, and imposes an unnecessary burden upon the Commission because it is required, in the case of each product, to determine the maximum tariff concession which could be made without injury. This restriction will inevitably entail serious delays. The Tariff Commission will have to decide in advance any possible future injury to domestic interests.

The obligations placed upon the Tariff Commission, composed of six Commissioners, three of each major political party, plus the requirement of the bill, that no agreement may be entered into until the Commission, as such, has reported to the President, plus the limitation of the President's authority to 1 year, is a guaranty of no action. Placing upon the Tariff Commission the sole responsibility for determining limits below which a cut may not be made without threatening injury to a domestic producer or impairing the national defense deprives other governmental agencies of the opportunity to exercise the influence which their responsibilities would seem to justify. For example, the Tariff Commission's judgment should not be preeminent in the field of national defense over that of the Military Establishment. Under the present procedure, that is why other agencies are now represented in the interdepartmental trade-agreements committee. The authority which seems to have been given to the President for a year is wholly nullified by red tape.

On the other hand the requirement that Tariff Commission officers or employees should not participate in the recommendations to the President with respect to the extent of any cut, and should not participate in the negotiation of any agreement, deprives the President of trusted and competent counselors and an effective aid in negotiating the best possible bargains for the United States. It tends to set one governmental agency off against all others.

This bill tends to destroy the entire interdepartmental cooperative efforts of the past 14 years. For example, requirement that the Tariff Commission alone shall hold public hearings deprives other interested Government departments from participating in such hearings and the right of cross-examining witnesses, aspects of the hearings which have been of the utmost value in the past. The provision that the President may disregard the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, but only by submitting the entire agreement for congressional veto, is nothing more than window dressing meant to nullify any independent Presidential authority. The Congress would undoubtedly follow the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, if that agency could ever agree on the extent of any cuts. This sort of confused and divided authority is improper because it puts the President in the position of having to submit to the Congress a disagreement between himself and an agency which is administered by his own appointees.

Since recent polls show that from 70 to 80 precent of the people favor the present program irrespective of party it is politically unpopular to oppose reciprocity as such, so everyone wants to at least appear in favor of it. These amendments are innocent enough looking but they are devised to kill the effective program successfully operated for 14 years under the act. During every past renewal there have been offered amendments, any one of which would give us "reciprocity in form" but an act without any substance whatever. That is exactly what H. R. 6556 provides. We are all familiar with the common practice of defeating legislation by amendments, when the originators of such amendments can evade the responsibility for defeat. That is exactly the kind of amendment we have to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Let us not try to fool the American people with this back-door sabotage. This amendment has been craftily drawn to give the form of reciprocity; that is not enough.

In my estimation this act should be renewed in a workable form for the following principal reasons:

First. Without such authority as is contained in the present act the President could not conclude new agreements with several countries, which were not

present at Geneva and the expansion of whose trade would be advantageous to world recovery. Such agreements with these countries would be concomitant with objectives of the charter for an International Trade Organization, if the charter is accepted by the United States and other major trading countries of the world.

Second. Without the act there will be uncertainty regarding Presidential authority to withhold benefits even from nonagreement countries which might flagrantly discriminate against the commerce of the United States. The authority may become more important for this purpose in the future.

Third. This Government might be prevented, without the trade agreement authority, from making broad and necessary modifications in agreements such as now being undertaken with Mexico. Since some of the older agreements do not have the standard escape clause contained in the Geneva agreement it would not be possible to make certain other desirable adjustments.

Fourth. For the sake of world stability the trade program should be continued. The United States will lose world leadership toward reductions in world trade barriers, which it has maintained since 1934. Through that leadership there was concluded last October at Geneva an agreement covering half of the commerce of the world, termed by the President "a landmark in the history of international economic relations."

I believe the majority of the American people are well convinced that neither economic nor political isolation is possible for any country in this modern world. To depend on the possibility of such isolation is to defeat the trends of modern industrial forces which bring the world closer together day by day. We might well ponder the words of Cordell Hull, as a warning at this moment, when he said in a broadcast as early as July 23, 1942:

> After the last war too many nations, including our own, tolerated or participated in attempts to advance their own interests at the expense of any system of collective security and of opportunity for all. Too many of us were blind to the evil which, thus loosed, created growing cancers within and among nations—political suspicions and hatred; the race of armaments, first stealthy and then the subject of flagrant boasts; economic nationalism and its train of economic depression and misery; and, finally, the emergence from their dark places of the looters and thugs who found their opportunity in disorder and disaster.

In this new postwar situation we need to indicate in a positive manner that we are sincere in our efforts to work out, as far as can be done without injury to any substantial domestic industry, a sound approach to the solution of world economic problems. The reciprocal trade agreements are a partial solution.

We can hold the confidence of the people of the world with a consistent foreign policy. We should not, after 14 years of hard work and accomplishment, abandon or weaken the reciprocal trade agreements program. This long-established program is the economic counterpart of the political phases of our bipartisan foreign policy. This country cannot afford to falter in its long-time leadership of a world movement to lower trade barriers by mutual agreement among trading nations.

I want to read, in conclusion, a letter I received today from a New York businessman, H. V. Whelan, vice president of Nuodex International, Inc.:

> NUODEX INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
> *New York, N. Y., May 24, 1948.*
> The Honorable WALTER A. LYNCH,
> *Congress of the United States,*
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> HONORABLE SIR: Many of your constituents are closely watching congressional action on the renewal of the President's authority to negotiate trade agreements. Our keen interest in this issue is not because we have an axe to grind, for we do not, but because of the fundamental principles of economy involved.
>
> Gaged by its effect on the economy of our country, one of the most detrimental pieces of legislature ever concoted by a United States Congress was the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. Immediately after legislating prohibitive tariffs against the large community of nations with which we had been trading for many years, retaliatory tariffs were imposed against the automobiles, typewriters, electrical equipment, tires, farm machinery, chemical products, proprietary articles, and so forth, which for years had been produced by skilled American workmen in Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Wilmington, Syracuse, Buffalo, and so forth. What was the net result of the imposition of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act? Being unable to continue shipping the products enumerated above (and many others) to customers overseas who were ready and eager to buy them, the manufacturers packed up the machinery and special equipment with which they were made, and shipped entire factories to Argentina, Mexico, Cuba, Brazil, South Africa, and many other countries. The same machines made the same products, but the pay rolls were in Buenos Aires, Mexico City, Havana, Sao Paulo, Durban, and so forth, instead of in the American cities mentioned above. Wages for millions of man-hours were transferred from American industrial centers to foreign countries. And why—to protect the jobs—and the profits of the management—of a few thousand workers in a few industries producing something that could be produced more economically somewhere else. American consumer products were made in foreign factories by foreign labor. Large areas in foreign countries were planted with crops which previously had been purchased from the United States of America. Foreign industry in the broader sense, was given an effective incentive to compete against American industry.
>
> There is a parallel between the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act and the agitation which is becoming vocal against continuation of the policy of negotiating trade agreements with foreign countries to permit a two-way flow of trade.
>
> Those who want to buy what this country can produce more economically, or better, than anyone else, cannot do so unless we buy what the other countries produce. One-way trade is as impossible as is up-hill travel of water. Water can be forced up hill, but unless it is allowed to to run down again, there ceases to be travel. It becomes stagnant, as does international trade when our customers run out of funds with which to buy.
>
> We, as a creditor Nation with most of the gold in the world, are treading on dangerous ground if we restrict trade still further by imposing artificial barriers against the products of the countries which wish to buy from us. Much progress has been made during the past few years in leveling these barriers and letting water seek its own level. If this and similar issues were decided entirely on the basis of the economic factors involved without any personalities, pressure groups, or vested interests "pulling strings," there is no doubt how they would be decided as the principles involved are so clearcut and simple. Congressmen who place the welfare of the country above the welfare of a few individuals will refuse to be influenced by pressure groups, and will join in renewing the President's power to negotiate international trade agreements and will confirm the ITO charter.
>
> We are anxious to see which side of the fence you are on.
>
> Respectfully,
> NUODEX INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
> H. V. WHELAN, *Vice President.*

Mr. Chairman, that is the opinion of a practical businessman and I think it is thoroughly sound. I hope that this bill which has for its object the wrecking of the Hull reciprocal trade program will be defeated.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, in the 6 years since I began my service in Congress this question of reviewing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and determining whether to extend it and, if so, in what form and for how long, has been before us twice. On each occasion I have voted for the extension and against every amendment that conceivably would cripple or weaken it. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] will not deny that my record is clear and consistent in that regard.

I am going to vote for this bill. I am convinced that if people will examine the bill itself and study the program in terms of our present foreign trade situation, instead of taking for fact the propaganda against it that has been put out so recklessly and indiscriminately, they will find that the bill does not emasculate or endanger or sabotage or threaten the reciprocal trade agreements program, as has been charged. If I felt otherwise I would vote against it because I do not want to see the program weakened. I personally had thought it would be better to extend it for a longer period, but I recognize that with the review next spring of ERP, which will dominate so much of our foreign trade, and the coming into being of the International Trade Organization program, there are valid reasons for a 1-year extension. Furthermore, the charges to use the Tariff Commission should improve the actual operations in terms of our over-all economy and our national security. So, as between those who would have no program at all and those who would extend it for 3 years as is, I believe that this is a fair and workable middle ground and will give the program wider support than ever before.

I voted against the rule because I have been against all such rules in the past except on tax matters. I suspect that a closed rule will be misinterpreted as meaning there is something in the bill that will not bear the light of day, or cannot be defended against amendments. I thought an open rule should have been brought in, and if amendments could be offered that would improve the bill, adopt them. But I am convinced that the basic soundness of the bill is such that any

amendments I have heard proposed, except perhaps longer extension would be voted down. We should have debated and voted on all proposals openly before the country and thus educated people as to what actually is in it. I believe it can be shown that the bill does not cripple but in fact it is perhaps the best reciprocal trade agreement extension bill that has come before us since the program began.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, first and foremost, I am in favor of an extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program as an essential element in the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States. Second, I believe we should not inaugurate new arrangements in any bill against which arrangements protectionism could be charged, especially in a year when we are likely to have a new administration which should have an opportunity to recommend changes, if any, as its own.

Mr. Chairman, this is really a foreign affairs bill and not just a measure dealing with revenues or imports. The impact of this bill on the foreign policy of the United States will be great. Reciprocal trade agreements are essential to the success of the European recovery program and to our whole bipartisan foreign policy. This bill is designed either as a caretaker bill to keep the idea of reciprocal trade agreements alive, or by separating the Tariff Commission from the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee and giving the Congress veto power when the President deviates from the commission's recommendations bringing the program closer to protectionism.

The development of our country and our freedoms has always demanded a vigorous and effective private economy in the United States, and so in the days of our industrial infancy when it was necessary to enable productive enterprise in various fields to get out of its swaddling clothes in order to do an adult economic job here in the United States, protection in many industries could be adequately justified. But today when the United States is the greatest exporter of goods in the world, when the whole world hungers for our goods, when our costs of production in principal exports like machine tools and automobiles enables us to undersell foreign competition, and when our tobacco, cotton, and wheat are in great demand due to shortages in the world's export markets, we must reconsider our whole position. There is likely still to be room for tariff protection in some items, but our great productive power and our need for export markets must turn our emphasis toward trade rather than protection.

We are shipping goods overseas at the annual rate of $15,000,000,000 or five times the average of years 1936–38. Our gross national product has risen from $85,000,000,000 in 1938 to about $225,000,000,000 currently, while our exports are running at the rate of over 12 percent of our total production. Without question the most significant characteristic of our foreign trade is the high degree of unbalance between exports and imports with imports running at the annual rate of about $6,000,000,000 and exports at about $15,000,000,000. We had better have another good look and revise our whole concept of what is good business. As I see good business now it is to stabilize and assure our markets for exports and to increase our imports. This is the surest way to vitalize our own American industry on a competitive basis and to vastly improve the likelihood of stabilized prosperity for American business for the future; and when I say American business I include the investor, the manager, the worker, the farmer, and the consumer.

We have just made a major commitment in the ERP with respect to our whole foreign economic policy. This commitment is contained in section 102 (b) of title I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 in which we declare it to be one of the purposes of the ERP to facilitate and strengthen the growth of international trade of participating countries with one another and with other countries—and that obviously includes us—by appropriate measures including reduction of barriers which may hamper such trade. If that were not enough, substantially the same provision is contained in section 115 (a) (3) as a commitment required to be made by each participating country in the agreement for assistance with the United States. Progressive reduction of trade barriers is also contemplated by the Inter-American Treaty just negotiated at the Bogota Conference. The charter for the International Trade Organization, which we ourselves brought into being through the original provisions in the lend-lease agreements looking towards the reduction of trade barriers, carries an obligation "to enter into and carry out with such other member or members as the organization may specify, negotiations directed to the susbtantial reduction of tariffs and other charges on exports and imports."

The continuance of the reciprocal trade agreements program is, therefore, the obligation of a whole series of international commitments on our part. The economics of the ERP show that a great increase in exports by the participating countries will be required and especially to dollar countries in order to absorb the very large balance-of-trade deficit in dollars which forms the very basis of the problems sought to be answered by the ERP. It has been estimated that an increase from approximately $6,000,000,000 to $9,000,000,000 in the value of our imports would go far toward redressing the adverse trade balance in dollars which now faces the nations of the world, and that this increase is a normal one when compared with the increase of 85 percent in our own aggregate production above the 1935–39 level. The impact of such an increase in imports in decreasing our cost of living is bound to be great. This is especially true in the household and consumer items like china and clothing where we have seen the greatest price increases and even scarcity. We should not interfere with this expected increase of imports.

Now let us consider the bill actually before us. It extends the trade-agreements program for 1 year, and if that were the only thing it does though important, I do not believe that the objection would be so great, because, though it would hamper negotiations they could be continued and it leaves freedom for review of the whole program under the auspices of a new administration. The difficulty in the bill, however, is in the procedural barriers which it sets up and which are bound to emphasize protection instead of reciprocity, and to delay the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements. For by this bill, if the Tariff Commission finds in advance that a proposed tariff reduction will cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, then the President's agreement is subject to congressional veto, while the present standard enables us to take a calculated risk in advance that there might be some injury to domestic producers, but with an escape clause if it becomes serious according to Tariff Commission findings, as a result of "unforeseen developments and the concession granted." Obviously where the decision is made in advance rather than by the trial and error of performance, there will be much more tendency to encourage pure protectionism. Also, the time factor in submittal of an agreement to the Congress when in session and the uncertainty of its approval depreciates the negotiating ability of the President and makes it doubtful that any agreements can in fact be negotiated during the year of this extension.

Some eggs must be broken to serve the broad national policy to enable the nations of Europe to recover their solvency and to get them out of the position of being our dependents. A 1-year extension hedged in with the conditions of this bill introduces doubts in the minds of foreign peoples as to whether we intend ourselves to be bound by the very provisions for economic recovery through self-help and mutual cooperation which we have insisted on for the ERP, and in our agreements with the 16 European nations concerned.

It seems to me that by writing a bill of this character which is a departure from existing policy and sets up new methods for handling reciprocal-trade agreements, we are prejudicing not facilitating a new administration, for we are binding it on the one hand to the policy and on the other hand to a new way of effecting it without giving a new administration freedom to agree or disagree. Faced with a closed rule, it is likely that many Members, including myself, will seek to get a straight extension first, but will then vote for this bill only in order to get the renewal of this act on its legislative way, in the expectation that after the other body has considered it, and it has come through conference it will come back to us in proper shape. That is the path of responsibility in view of the urgent necessity in the interest of our whole foreign policy, for not letting the reciprocal-trade-agreements program die in this Congress.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a news item only a few days old of a statement made to members of the press by a former Republican governor, a former candidate for President on the Republican ticket, made in the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. I ask that that background be visualized, then to interpret what was said by the former Republican Presidential candidate, former Gov. Alf M. Landon, who ran for the office of President on the Republican ticket in 1936.

He was asked about the tariff bill approved by the House Ways and Means Committee—of course, that is the Republican members—and here is what former Governor, former Republican Presidential candidate Alf Landon is quoted as having said:

> The bill endangers the reciprocal trade program and endangers the whole policy of postwar economic reconstruction of the world. It threatens to waste the money we are advancing for foreign relief.

You have listened today to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] make a most unnecessary and unwarranted attack upon one of the greatest Americans of all times, General Marshall. I wonder who he thinks he is fooling? I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota thinks that he can, in the well of this Chamber, without resentment by the American people, make unjustified attacks upon a man of the character of General Marshall? It is one thing to disagree with a man, and I recognize the right of anyone to disagree and to express himsef in disagreement, but when I listened to the attack that he made and the manner in which he made it my blood boiled within me. The people of America know that General Marshall was the Chief of Staff during the war. Twelve million Americans wore the uniform under him—men and women, officers and enlisted men—and he was their Chief of Staff, and it was under his leadership that we won the war. The gentleman from Minnesota and many others voted against every bill that passed this Chamber prior to Pearl Harbor, bills necessary to save the liberty and the independence of our country. That is the type of argument you have, constant smearing and constant attacks upon outstanding men, the attack being directed because Chief of Staff Marshall, now Secretary of State, wrote the letter that he did to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. I can understand disagreement with the letter; I can appreciate argument being made contrary to the views expressed by Secretary Marshall, but I cannot understand at all the nature of the attack made upon him. The American people will resent it.

No, this bill means nothing more than a return to the Smoot-Hawley days; do not let us get away from that. This means that the iniquitous conditions that existed under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, and the preceding ones passed by Republican Congresses, are going to come back. Why even former President Hoover signed that bill with his tongue in his cheek, and when he did he made an accompanying statement apologizing for signing the Smoot-Hawley bill. I would admire the Republican Party more if they would have the courage to do directly what they are now doing indirectly by this bill, scuttling the Hull tariff program completely. The passage of this bill is a return to isolationism on the part of America. It shows what is going to happen if the Republicans ever get control of the White House. This bill is advance notice to the American people and it is advance notice to the nations of the world that if the Republicans by any chance should get control of the White House as a result of the election next fall, that our country is going to go back to isolationism. The American people might just as well realize that now. This, the high cost of living, and the rental situation are going to be major issues in the next campaign, because the Republican Party has made them issues.

If you wanted to put through an extension for 2 years, for example, without crippling amendments, that is one thing, or if you had the decency to come in and continue it for 1 year without crippling amendments, but you have crippling amendments in this bill that destroy it, without having the courage to do it directly. That is the thing to which we object, and which the American people will resent, and which will constitute bringing back the iniquitous days that existed under the Smoot-Hawley bill, and be a message to the world that under Republican control, despite what the leaders and Presidential candidates say one way, the Republican Party in Congress is bringing our country back to the days of isolationism. Let there be no misunderstanding on the part of the people in that regard. The Trade Agreements Act has been the keystone of our foreign policy for 14 years. The principle of the trade-agreement program is written into the European Cooperation Act of 1948. While we appropriate from year to year, that is a 4-year program. The passage of this bill is a violation or a contradiction of the provisions of the European Cooperation Act of 1948.

There we have the situation. We know that the true nature of this iniquitous document is revealed in section 52, wherein the President is authorized to raise tariffs to the level of 50 percent in excess of those prevailing under the Smoot-Hawley Act. Again, for all practical purposes, this delegates the power to make reciprocal trade agreements not as during the past 14 years to the President but to the Tariff Commission, because for all practical purposes under this bill nothing can be done unless the President agrees with the recommendations or the action of the Tariff Commission. Any time the President disagrees with any of the recommendations of the Tariff Commission the reciprocal trade agreement cannot become operative, and Congress within 60 days can overturn any such agreement. What country do you think is going to negotiate with us under these circumstances? The passage of this bill is a complete repudiation of the Hull reciprocal-trade program, and means a return to isolationism by the United States.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that what in my opinion is the most important matter which has come before this Congress this session will result, as indications now seem to be, in the end of one of the greatest programs the country has engaged upon in the last quarter of a century.

When the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934 our country was in the worst condition economically, as far as exports and imports were concerned, in its entire history. Through the past 14 years, by the hardest of work, the most careful nurture, we have built a foreign trade, not what we should have, but one growing year by year in its importance. To disrupt this great program now will be one of the saddest things that has happened at this session.

I should like to read an excerpt from one of Mr. Hull's last messages to the Congress:

> We shall soon have another chance to make a peace. This time we propose to make one that will last. We know that it cannot be lasting unless it embraces not only political and military affairs but also arrangements to provide the essential prerequisites to economic prosperity and to maintaining and improving standards of living in our own and in all countries. The trade-agreements program is one of these essentials. Its purpose has always been—and must continue to be—to bring about a reduction or elimination, on a reciprocal basis of mutual benefit, of excessive barriers to trade which impair the well-being of all countries and thus undermine peaceful and friendly relations among nations.

Some people have an erroneous idea of the meaning of foreign or world trade. They seem to cling to the idea that trading with the world means selling the rest of the world our goods without buying any of theirs. Trading means the exchange of goods for goods—just as the farmer takes his produce to town and exchanges it for the supplies he needs, as the trapper on the frontier used to exchange his furs for food and clothing. So we see that if we will have world trade we must take the goods and products of other countries in exchange for ours. We must buy as well as sell. To revive this trading this administration devised these reciprocal trade agreements. These agreements make it easier for the foreign buyers of our goods to find a market for their goods here. Each one provides increased opportunities for a country to expand its purchases of our goods, provides that the trade of one country shall be treated fairly by the other country to the agreement relative to the trade of a third country, thereby preventing discrimination.

These trade treaties became necessary because as we built high tariff walls in this country, other countries of the world retaliated by building high tariff walls against our goods and these tariffs became formidable barriers to world trade. It was found to be impossible to get rid of all these trade barriers at once, but these trade agreements, by reducing our tariffs on some goods in exchange for an agreement on the part of another

country to reduce its tariffs and other restrictions on our goods, encouraged trade instead of discouraging it.

These trade agreements are openly and fairly made. Mr. Noble, Under Secretary of Commerce, has given a clear description of the method of their negotiation, as follows:

Before we enter into trade-agreement negotiations with a country, public announcement is made of our intention to do so. The trade-agreements work is conducted by the Trade Agreements Committee, an interdepartmental undertaking in which participate the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce, and the Tariff Commission. This committee is made up of nonpartisan experts, men of experience and judgment in foreign trade, who have no interest in anything except what is best for the country as a whole.

As a result of study of the trade and products of the two countries, there is published at the time announcement is made of intention to negotiate a trade agreement a list of products in respect of which we will consider making concessions to the other country.

When these products have been announced in this open and aboveboard manner, so that everybody who produces or deals in these products may know about it, then a date is set when all interested persons may be heard. If you don't think a product in which you are interested should be included in these negotiations, you have a full chance to say so. You can appear before the Committee for Reciprocity Information at public hearings in Washington and state your case, or you can file a written brief of your arguments and have them carefully considered. In one way or another everybody affected has a chance to be heard—an equal chance. There are no back-door methods; no chances for lobbyists to exert political pressure; no secret deals or swaps.

Normally the United States can and does produce more of a great number of farm and industrial products than can profitably be sold in the American market. When large quantities of such goods cannot be exported, our agricultural products pile up in unmarketable surpluses and our industrial production slows down. The result is felt throughout the country in depressed prices, unemployment, reduced wages, and poorer home markets for American producers.

Trade between nations declined sharply after 1929, largely because most nations, including the United States, set up excessive barriers against imports. By thus making it difficult for its people to buy things they needed and desired from other countries, each country made it difficult—in many cases impossible—for its own producers to sell their exportable surpluses in other countries.

The Trade Agreements Act was then set up and our foreign trade began to expand. A market gradually was being made for our surplus production. The United States was on its way to taking its proper place in the world. This country emerged from the war as the No. 1 Nation, but it has one strong rival. Now we must lead whether we will or not. Our course may determine the future of the world.

BENEFITS OF FOREIGN TRADE

Expansion of our trade with foreign countries benefits the whole country:

First. It benefits directly the great branches of American agriculture and the many industries, large and small, that have products to sell in foreign markets.

Second. It benefits directly American producers who use imported raw materials or semi-manufactured products in making their finished products.

Third. It benefits many workers dependent upon these branches of agriculture and industry essential for their livelihood.

Fourth. It improves domestic markets for American producers not directly interested in export or import trade; American farmers and manufacturers who can sell more of their goods in foreign markets—and their employees as well—are better customers for the goods and services of Americans not in the business of exporting or importing.

Fifth. It raises living standards by providing more employment, more purchasing power, and more goods for American consumers at reasonable prices; it increases, to our mutual advantage, the exchange of products we grow or manufacture to better advantage than other countries, for products that other countries can grow or manufacture to better advantage than we can.

FOREIGN TRADE IS TWO-WAY TRADE

Foreign trade necessarily is two-way trade. We cannot export unless we import; we cannot import unless we export. Our exports provide purchasing power for the things we import; our imports provide purchasing power to foreign countries for the things they buy from us. People in foreign countries can buy our products only to the extent that they can acquire United States dollars to pay for them, and the only way they can acquire dollars is through the sale in this country of their products (including gold and silver) and services, or by borrowing. Loans, even if available to them, merely postpone the ultimate necessity for payment in the form of commodities or services. If such payment is prevented, defaulted debts are inevitable.

It is deplorable that this great program is to be destroyed before peace is restored to the world.

The people of America want this program continued—their disappointment will find expression in the days ahead.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, as is so often the case, we lose sight of what the real issue is before us, sometimes as the result of an honest misconception of the bill, and sometimes as a result of deliberate political maneuvering, and criticism of the bill which is inspired for political purposes.

The issue in this case is not at all whether—as you might suppose from hearing some of the preceding speakers—we are going to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This bill does extend the reciprocal trade-agreements program. The question merely is a matter of administration, and that is whether this reciprocal-trade program is going to continue to be administered by the Committee on Reciprocity Information, which it seems to me has shown very little regard for the welfare of industry and very little knowledge of tariff questions, or whether we are going to substitute for that committee, which has done its work badly, the Tariff Commission, which is the normal and appropriate body in our Government to handle tariff questions. It seems to me it is as simple as that.

As a matter of fact, in many instances the State Department has handled this matter very badly, indeed. One of the most shocking examples of their inept handling of it was revealed in the month of April, when, a couple of weeks after Czechoslovakia had given up to communism and had disappeared behind the iron curtain, the President, through his advisers in the Department, put into effect by proclamation a trade agreement with Czechoslovakia. In that trade agreement there were drastic cuts on dozens of items of glassware, for example. I speak of glassware, because that is a matter of considerable importance in my district. I was a little surprised to hear the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] imply that the cost of production should not be considered very much in these problems. Just last week I had the privilege of being in a very large glass factory in my district. I saw people working there, men who were getting $1.70 an hour and getting as much as 30- and 35-percent bonus for doing effective work. I saw girls 18 and 19 years old making $200 a month. If we do not consider that cost of production, if we do not consider this American standard of living, it seems to me we are on the wrong track. We have been on the wrong track. So the issue is very simple. We are merely substituting for the State Department, which has revealed itself incompetent to do this job, the Tariff Commission.

Furthermore, we are doing one more thing which is exceedingly important, and that is that if the President concludes to execute a tariff agreement, notwithstanding the objections and study made by the Tariff Commission, then, finally, under this bill, that agreement cannot be effective until it comes before the Congress and lies before the Congress for a period of 60 days, during which period we have a right to denounce that agreement. That is exactly what I have been fighting for; fighting to restore to Congress its constitutional right and duty to deal with any mistakes which may have been made by the President.

This bill has been subjected to the usual smear technique by the Administration, which has been yelping with anguish at the prospect of the State Department having its unlimited powers over tariff matters curtailed.

The reciprocal trade program has heretofore been handled entirely by the State Department, and has been used extensively as an instrument in carrying out a confused and inept foreign policy. Concessions have been made without due regard to the effect on domestic industry; in fact, as I have said, it has been handled by a group that had little knowledge of the need of domestic industry and a vast indifference to its welfare.

The trouble with reciprocal trade, as handled by the State Department, has been that there has not been too much

trade, and it certainly has not been reciprocal. Trade is an exchange, and reciprocal means on an equitable basis, with some benefits moving to both parties. But what has been happening is that we have continuously reduced our tariffs to encourage the imports of foreign goods at a time when we could not export for money or trade. We have been exporting, but for the most part, we have been exporting only gifts. The program has been on a one-way street in which all of the concessions have been made by the United States, and none of any consequence by any foreign countries. The cry is to reduce or eliminate barriers against trade, and I agree—but the trouble is that the barriers that have been reduced have been ours, while foreign barriers, including export and import quotas, and licenses, have been strengthened and increased.

The immediate effect of the ridiculous concessions made to the Czechs will largely be felt by workers in handmade glassware, but the ultimate effect, if the program is not sensibly supervised, will constitute a serious threat to the whole glass industry in my district employing over 9,000 workers. Why this great industry and these workers should be subjected to such economic hazards for the benefit of Czechoslovaks is one of the major mysteries in the chaotic conduct of our foreign affairs.

Notwithstanding the cries of those who hate to let go of any of their power, the present legislation does not, by any means, impair our policy of reciprocal trade. It extends the program for a year, but it does substitute, as it should, the Tariff Commission as the proper body to study these tariff questions instead of the diplomats of the Department of State.

The power of Congress to veto a bad agreement is what I have been seeking to restore for a long time, and is almost precisely modeled after the bill I introduced in April 1947. If such provision had been in effect, you can rest assured the further concessions recently made to Czechoslovakia would not have been made.

I am for reciprocal trade, but I want it to be reciprocal. When we make the vast concessions that we have, for example to Great Britain, and when we loan and give billions of dollars worth of commodities to Great Britain, I do not want to see Great Britain pay us back for our generosity by monopolizing the market in cocoa, and forcing up the price of cocoa, thereby exacting tribute from every person in America, who buys a piece of chocolate. That is precisely what is happening today.

Mr. Chairman, I have made a considerable study of this problem nationally, and I have made a particularly intense study of the question as it affects my district, more particularly the glass workers and glass industry of my district. In that connection, I have consulted extensively with Mr. Harry Cook, President of the American Flint Glass Workers Union, with Mr. Lee Minton, President of the Glass Bottle Blowers Union, and with many local officials of local unions, including the American Plate Glass Workers. I have talked on numerous occasions with the leaders and management of the industry. This program in the hands of the State Department constitutes a threat to the whole industry; but the extension of the program, with the safeguards that have been provided does not.

I voted against this program before. I am glad to support this bill, with the changes that have been made. I congratulate the committee on the excellent job they have done to continue the program, but at the same time, to set up proper protection for local industry.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in supporting this bill, I hope it will be clearly understood that I do not oppose the economic philosophy of the Reciprocal Agreement Act. As a matter of fact, I have supported in the past all renewals of that act that have come before the House. Frankly, I believe in the program. But I cannot for one moment believe that this bill, if enacted, spells the death of the program. If I so believed I would be against it. I am not panic-stricken by some of the assertions made by the opponents to this bill that its passage will wreck the whole thing and incidentally wreck all of our economic relations the world over and make impossible the successful operation of ECA. I cannot bring myself to any such belief as I read the terms of this bill. For many years I have been a very firm admirer of the present Secretary of State. I have no sympathy whatsoever with some of the suggestions that have been made on the floor today to the effect that the last war cost three times as much under his military leadership as it should have cost, or any other aspersions upon his record. I may say at this point that it is my view and conviction that General Marshall headed the finest army the world has ever known, the best fed, the best clothed, the best equipped, and led with the greatest brilliancy. It achieved a victory seldom if ever equaled in the history of the world. So let us put aside the suggestion that this man is not an able man.

At the same time, I regret that the Secretary of State wrote such a letter as was read to us in part, I believe—perhaps in its entirety—by the gentleman from North Carolina. The people across the seas, reading a letter of that sort from the American Secretary of State, are apt to come to the belief, and I fear some of them may, that this bill means the abandonment of the reciprocal trade agreements policy of the United States Government. It may be impertinent upon my part to observe at this point that I doubt the Secretary of State would have written such a letter or expressed such an opinion had he consulted some of the Members of this House.

Now, looking toward the future—and I know that prophecy is a risky business—none of us know exactly how the next administration of this Government will be composed. I am not going to talk politics or suggest any political conditions in the months to come; but, however the next administration is composed and under whatever party leadership, I cannot believe for one moment that that administration will deliberately wreck the reciprocal trade-agreement program. I do not think it will be as grossly partisan as that. The next administration, whoever is at the head of it, Democrat or Republican, will have ample time to study, for example, the then apparent effects of the ECA program which must be reported to the Congress early in the next session; and also it will have ample time to study the suggestions which will be contained in and submitted to the Congress under what is known as the ITO program. Those two things, and I shall not go into detail about them, are intimately connected with the ultimate objectives, we will say, of the reciprocity program. They should all be considered together and weighed together.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have absolute confidence that they will be considered together and thus weighed. Not for one moment do I believe or have any confidence in these prophecies uttered upon this floor in this debate to the effect that the passage of this bill will end the reciprocal trade-agreements philosophy. I believe we are living in a modern world where conditions are not the same as they were 20, 30, or 40 years ago; that there must be more cooperation amongst the nations. I think the administrations to come will agree with that. That being my belief, I am not frightened by the passage of this bill. If it does not pass my dread is that there will be no renewal at all; and that, to my mind, would be a catastrophe.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the time set under the rule for discussion of this bill is drawing to a close. I regret exceedingly that the minority during the entire debate this afternoon, with one exception, has completely ignored the resolution under consideration and has completely ignored any reference to specific ways in which this legislation, if passed, would create the terrible conditions which they picture. I said there was one exception; that was the gentleman from Arkansas, who did present to this House his judgment of the matter. You will recall he outlined wherein he felt that the Tariff Commission as a body could not accomplish the task which was being assigned it under this legislation. I have a high regard for the opinions of that gentleman, but I wonder whether he and the Members of the House are acquainted with the fact that the Tariff Commission today is doing basically just exactly what we are now asking them to do by this resolution in the future.

I want to call his attention to studies made by the Tariff Commission prior to the negotiations that were entered into in Geneva. I think it would be wise for every Member of the House who has any question on this score to examine those studies. I hold in my hand 1 out of 16 volumes prepared by the Tariff Commission, called the Trade Agreements Digest. It contains complete factual

information with regard to all of the commodities that were under discussion at Geneva. It was prepared for use of the negotiators. Now this is public information and does not contain an additional recommendation made by the Tariff Commission to the negotiators. The additional recommendation is a secret one setting forth to the negotiators what the Commission itself feels is a reasonable limit to which the negotiators can go in establishing new duties.

Since we are not imposing any new system which has been untried as far as being impracticable from the standpoint of the Tariff Commission is concerned, it certainly cannot be claimed that the trade program is crippled because of the provision requiring findings by the Tariff Commission. Yet if you will read the debates that have transpired this afternoon, the remarks of the minority, you will find that they have discussed the personality of practically all of the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee; they have discussed the question of whether we should have a high tariff or low tariff; the question of internationalism and isolationism, but nowhere have they attacked the basic principle involved in the resolution here being considered except in vague generalities. Therefore, I suppose they have no such argument against it and must confine themselves to generalities.

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

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, many people seem to be of the opinion that it is unthinkable that the Congress should fail to rubber stamp the request of the President for a 3-year extension without amendment. The administration is of course within its rights in making such a request. By the same token we are within our rights in extending the act for a shorter period and with administrative changes which we believe will be an improvement. I regret that responsible officials of the State Department in criticizing our contemplated action have made statements so obviously extravagant that I fear public confidence in the Department will not be enhanced.

We are told that if we pass this bill it will be said in the other countries that we have reverted to isolationism. With the knowledge abroad of the billions we are sending over to help our sister nations and with the knowledge that we are the largest trading Nation in the world it is hard to imagine that our friends in foreign lands will call us isolationists.

We are extending the Trade Agreements Act and that is the story that will go abroad. I doubt if there is any magic in the figure 3 or that American leadership will be imperiled because we fail to use it. We are extending the act.

There is abundant logic in extending the act to June 30, 1949. That is the date which marks the end of the base period provided for ERP. Just as the Congress anticipated that it would be wise to have an opportunity to review the administration and working of ERP at the end of 15 months so will we be wise today when we so legislate that the succeeding Congress, the Eighty-first, will have a chance to review the administration of the Foreign Assistance Act and the extended Trade Agreements Act at the same time.

There is also abundant logic in setting up the Tariff Commission as the board to make a study of items submitted by the President and after hearings report to him. This Commission, trained in tariff matters, should certainly make a more satisfactory fact-finding body than the Committee on Reciprocity Information which it will replace. Criticism currently leveled at the administrative machinery of the act will be reduced. The making of trade agreements will be put on a business basis and removed from fear or suspicion that the domestic welfare is being subordinated to considerations of international policy.

Many important segments of American industry, agriculture, and labor are justifiably apprehensive in the present situation in the light of the experience with the trade-agreements program as administered for the past 14 years. These basic elements of our economy will take renewed confidence when this bill is passed.

Many well-intentioned groups and individuals not versed in the intricacies of tariffs and trade but relying upon the representations of others in asking Congress to extend the act without change are worrying about the wrong thing. Instead of being alarmed about failure of our leadership in world affairs they should be evidencing real concern about our domestic welfare.

I doubt the wisdom of too much too-free trading with nations whose wage standards are notoriously lower than our own. It would be disastrous indeed if the standard of living of American workers should be forced down to the lower level prevailing in other lands.

Under our Constitution the only authority to deal with tariffs is vested in the Congress. Whatever authority the President or the State Department are now exercising in the matter of trade agreements was delegated to them by the Congress. In this sweeping delegation of power, never intended by the framers of the Constitution, we have departed pretty far from the ancient landmarks. I am satisfied that the American people will applaud our action in writing into this extension bill the reasonable provision for having the President seek advice on contemplated changes from a board trained in tariff matters and allowing the Congress to pass upon his action if he fails to follow that advice.

I believe in the principle of reciprocal trade. Reciprocity has been good American doctrine and good Republican doctrine since the days of McKinley. But reciprocity has been overlooked in some of the trade agreements thus far entered into. Concessions have been granted which leave reciprocity out. The danger is that the State Department charged with the responsibilities of diplomacy, in its zeal to promote international good will may enter into trade agreements with other nations without full consideration of the possible impact upon our own domestic economy.

Our Government was designed to be a government of checks and balances. We will help to keep it so when we write the proposed procedure into this bill today.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, the details and operation of the proposals made under H. R. 6556 have been thoroughly and ably discussed by some of the majority members of the committee. Consequently, any additional discussion of the technicalities of this bill will serve no useful purpose. I would like to make a few observations.

There is not a Member of this body who does not believe in and support economic progress. The function of our whole economic activity is to produce food, shelter, clothing, and other goods and services essential for the material welfare of a people.

Since the dawn of the history of mankind there has never been wholly adequate supplies and distribution of these goods and services.

Economic progress consists in making these supplies more abundant and doing this in such a manner that all people have a full opportunity to participate in this progress. All economic systems are concerned with producing, distribution and consumption—getting goods produced and making equitable distribution and consumption.

Nations have tried, or are trying, various patterns. The method in the United States is a system of free, private enterprise which is intimately related to our basic freedom of the individual and his individual rights.

The United States through its system of free, private enterprise has enabled our people to achieve a degree of economic well-being that has no parallel in all history.

We want to enjoy and share our economic progress with honorable people throughout the world.

There is not a member of this committee, or of this Congress, who does not want to develop international trade to the fullest; who does not want to export our products and materials, and import the products and materials of other nations in a manner that will promote the economic progress and well-being of all concerned. Our enormous production machine is geared to many necessary imports.

We are not a high protective country and have not been for some years. Experts listed us about sixth in the order of height-protection duties before the recent war, but now few countries have less tariff protection than does the United States. Possibly ours will, under the Geneva agreement, be lower than any competing country.

Referring to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], the decreases agreed to at Geneva affect more items in the tariff than has ever been the case before. About 3,600 rates are affected. It is the first time any major tariff changes have been made at one time in which no elected representatives of the people in Congress assembled had

any direct part. Between 1934 and the Geneva Conference about 1,200 item changes in the Tariff Act of 1930 had been made. In this also Congress had no direct part.

Since the beginning of lend-lease, and with the $17,000,000,000 proposed for the Marshall plan, this country will have given away approximately $85,000,000,000 in supplies—consumer and durable goods. All this out of American production.

It appears that a vast majority of the opponents of this measure give credit to the reciprocal trade agreements for the tremendous export business they have enjoyed in this period. This assumption is obviously completely without foundation. And the assumption is more than likely responsible for the favorable sentiment expressed by the gentleman from North Carolina a moment ago.

Many editorials and letters received indicate that some of the opposition is firm in the belief that if this legislation is approved, all export and import trade will immediately terminate.

This belief has been expounded by administration spokesmen. Of course, the statement is a gross misstatement of facts and the conclusions are wholly erroneous.

No existing agreement will be disturbed, and provisions remain for the orderly negotiation of other agreements. And to say that the prescribed preliminary procedures would involve undue delay is to confess a lack of understanding of the provisions.

And to say the proposal will sabotage the reciprocal trade program is too ridiculous to be discussed. No responsible person could make the statement and be serious about it. If the reciprocal trade program is wrecked under this bill, the administration will have to wreck it.

There has been so much recent emphasis on the volume of foreign trade that many have lost sight of the essential objects of such trade.

There are many who seem to believe that if only international trade can somehow be made big enough, the present economic inequalities between nations will be wiped out. This is wishful thinking.

The prosperity of a nation, or an area, depends upon the quantity of goods and services which that nation or area can produce and consume not upon the percentage of those goods which are shipped in international trade.

No matter how much is first exchanged with other nations the total available for a nation itself to consume is, over a period, equal to the amount produced and no more.

Some nations find it difficult or uneconomic to produce certain items. These they seek abroad and they endeavor to produce in excess of their own needs enough other goods to pay for the things they want to import.

Their foreign trade, be it large or small, is based upon what they need to import, and the quantity they can afford to import, that is the quantity they can afford to pay for by means of exports. The prime purpose of foreign trade is to allow nations to obtain things they do not have.

This is simple to understand but the matter has been confused by the propaganda of the State Department which, since 1934, has sought to prove that increased foreign trade is the cure for all of the world's ills.

Rabid proponents of undeviating blind adherence to the administration's course of action in the Geneva Conference with 18 foreign nations profess to believe that there no middle ground on this trade-agreement question; that opponents to the extreme lengths to which the administration intends to go, are advocates of economic isolationism.

In other words, if you are not lily white you must be per se inky black. That is nothing but Simon-pure political clap-trap.

Our people have every reason to be apprehensive regarding the result of foreign trade when world economic conditions approach an even keel and the operation of the Geneva agreements become fully effective.

They will find that we have made all the sacrifices and that is the very reason they will welcome the safeguards provided in this measure.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. May I say to the Members on the opposite side of the aisle who are so astonished that the Democrats are opposing this bill and so astonished that the Democrats have contended that this bill is the beginning of the end of our reciprocal trade program, that if they read the newspapers they would find that we Democrats today are expressing the popular opinion of the American people in their opposition to the bill offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

I refer the Members, Mr. Chairman, to such newspapers as the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, the Boston Herald, the Washington Post, the Washington Evening Star, the Washington Daily News, the Denver Post, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the San Francisco Chronicle, the Christian Science Monitor, and so forth. Newspaper after newspaper from New York to Texas and from California to Georgia is opposed to this bill and rightly. It is the beginning of the same ruinous program that helped bring on the depression in 1929.

Yesterday I inserted in the RECORD editorial comment from other newspapers, expressing their concern of the program offered by Republican leadership in the House as a substitute for our reciprocal trade agreements program. As the New York Post said on May 7:

> Any refusal to extend the act (trade agreements) unamended for the full 3 years requested will be the tip-off that many Republicans are reverting to type. A type which can scarcely be trusted to guide America to responsible world leadership in the demanding days to come.

The policy followed under Secretary of State Hull and President Roosevelt in building up a sound and equitable trade program throughout the world has been endorsed by the great majority of both parties because it has benefited the business interests, the farmers, and the working people of this country.

We are the richest Nation in the world today, and one of the most important factors which contributes to our prosperity is the fact that trade barriers do not shut off commerce between the States. This rule holds good for the community of nations. We have supported it and have assumed world leadership in the international economic field.

As the San Francisco Chronicle said on April 7:

> Reciprocal trade has been the ruling policy of the United States in its foreign economic relations for 14 years. It is part and parcel of our whole tariff structure; it is at work right now in a vast, complex world pattern of exchange of goods and there is no justification at all for the apparent determination of a few strategically placed foes of this policy to strangle it. * * * Passage of the European recovery program has given a wholly new significance to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. * * * What kind of sense would it make for the United States now to reject the very course for which we have exacted their pledges? Failure to extend the reciprocal-trade policy would be taken by the world as a signal of American retreat into economic isolationism.

The reason that this bill before us is destructive of the whole reciprocal trade agreements program is that it opens the door to logrolling, which shows that the Republican leadership which has endorsed this bill either does not believe in reciprocal trade agreements or does not understand them. Those who are honestly opposed to the reciprocal trade-agreement program are for this bill because it does just what they want. No wonder they think that turning over our whole trade program to the Tariff Commission is a good idea.

The Tariff Commission is an agency which protects the interests of those who want tariffs. This group has a right to representation, but it has not the right to the sole representation in this program. Under the present arrangement the Tariff Commission is one of seven Government agencies representing various phases of the American economy. For instance, the Department of Agriculture protects the interests of the farmer; the Department of Labor protects the interests of the worker; the Department of Commerce, that of all industry—not just high tariff industry; the Department of Interior, our basic resources; the Department of Defense represents the security interests. Under the Republican bill, the Tariff Commission would be made superior to all other interests in our economic life and would be made the final word, with added pressure from Congressmen who represent districts with specific interests.

The pages of history show plenty of examples of the way such logrolling works out. One of the Members today referred to a declaration of political faith. I think this bill is a declaration of Republican political faith—a faith that dates back to pre-McKinley days. It is a retreat to isolationism. It is an indication of what we can expect if the Government of this country is to be

turned over to people who practice this philosophy.

If that wing of the Republican Party, which has voted with some international vision in the past, expects to have its votes count in the future, it had better vote with the Democrats today.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much criticism of the subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee for not having held open hearings on this very important bill which is the core of sound international economic policy. I shall include in the Appendix of the RECORD today a press release of the protests made by many organizations whose knowledge of the reciprocal-trade program is of long standing.

To quote another editorial—that which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 29:

> In this issue the Republican Party * * * faces a critical test of its fitness for the momentous responsibilities of the next 4 years.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the reciprocal trade agreements program has been the keystone of America's foreign commercial policy since 1934, and its adoption was one of the major accomplishments of the Roosevelt administration. This forward-looking and progressive program is based upon two major premises: one, that world peace and foreign trade are inseparable, and that a thriving international trade is one of the economic cornerstones of world peace; and two, that America's prosperity requires the expansion of our foreign trade, especially, our export trade, with other nations. In other words, the trade-agreements program was an integral part of the Roosevelt foreign policy of international cooperation and his domestic program of full employment and his economic bill of rights.

The immediate objective of this program was to expand American export trade by authorizing the President to conclude trade agreements with other countries in which the United States tariff rates are lowered on noncompetitive commodities in exchange for trade concessions in the trade-agreement country. The effect of such agreements has been to stimulate American exports by providing to foreign countries more dollar purchasing power to buy American goods. The record shows that the program has been a successful operation. Following the enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Act in 1934, the value of American exports increased steadily. During 1935 our exports exceeded those of 1934 by $150,000,000; during 1936 they increased by $173,000,000 over 1935; and during 1937 they increased by $893,000,000 over 1936. American exports during 1938 and 1939 were well above the 1936 figure.

The economic consequences of this program of expanding foreign trade has been more employment, greater production, higher per capita incomes, and better living standards for the people of our Nation. This is especially true for my State of Minnesota. The pattern of Minnesota's economy is most sensitive to changes in the level of foreign trade, and her prosperity is dependent upon a sound and thriving international commerce. The State's agricultural, mining, transportation, and manufacturing industries all benefit from any increase in export sales, and have benefited directly from the reciprocal trade-agreements program.

For example, considerable amounts of Minnesota meat, corn, wheat, and flour finds its way into the channels of foreign trade. Our State produces the iron ore needed to produce farm and other machinery, trucks, tractors, and automobiles which are shipped abroad. Minnesota's railroad and shipping industries are vital links in our foreign commerce and the volume of tonnage handled varies directly with foreign trade flucutations. Among the industrial commodities produced in Minnesota for export are condensed milk, asphalt roofing, dental equipment, sporting goods, rubber goods, and many others.

Thus, I can say with certainty that Minnesota has benefited greatly from the expansion of foreign trade resulting from the trade-agreements program. This program has meant expanded pay rolls, better pay and more production in our iron mines, and our manufacturing industries—it has meant a greater income for Minnesota's farmers, and a greater flow of tonnage over our railroad and transportation system. My State has an important stake in the trade-agreements program and the maintenance of high levels of production and employment will depend greatly on exports in the years ahead.

Because of the importance of the reciprocal trade agreements program to the people of my district and my State, I must protest against the measure now under consideration (H. R. 6556) to emasculate the Trade Agreements Act. The Republican-sponsored bill would destroy the trade-agreements program by setting up complicated and unworkable procedures to prevent the President from negotiating new agreements. The provision which permits the Congress to override the Chief Executive in making tariff reductions can have only that effect.

By vesting the power to determine minimum tariff rates in the Tariff Commission instead of the Committee for Reciprocity Information, our tariff rates are certain to be manipulated for the benefit of various selfish and monopoly interests in the United States without regard for the interests of the workers, farmers, consumers, and businessmen of America. H. R. 6556 will make possible the imposition of tariff rates 50 percent higher than those authorized by the unsound Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, which resulted in tariff wars, the stagnation of international trade and which contributed to world depression. Expansion of the program for only 1 year creates doubts as to United States future commercial policy, and will be a serious blow to America's leadership in the field of world economic cooperation.

In my opinion, this proposal reflects the reactionary and eighteenth-century philosophy of the Republican Party which has proved so unworkable in practice. Its enactment will tend to undermine international economic cooperation and retard the establishment of the economic foundation for world peace. It will tend to make the heavy burdens placed on our economy by the ERP heavier still. For this reason, I want to go on record as opposing this unwise proposal. I also want to say that I am in full support of the minority proposal to extend the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its present form for another 3 years. In supporting the 3-year extension substitute amendment, I know that I am speaking in the best interests of Minnesota and the Nation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I have always favored international cooperation to stabilize trade, reduce artificial barriers, adjust monetary exchange differentials, and thus encourage the flow of healthy commercial intercourse between nations. But these measures must be executed, I submit, without jeopardizing the high prevailing American standards of wages and living to which our own labor, industry, and agriculture have become accustomed.

I have the honor to represent a district which is to a large extent industrial. It is a district of many factories, large and small, producing a truly tremendous quantity of diversified products. A high level of wages prevails in general. Reasonable hours and wholesome conditions of work are in effect. The health, safety, and welfare of our faithful workers are protected to as generous a degree as any place in the country. Our farms and homes are for the most part well-built, modernized and equipped with up-to-date comforts and conveniences.

These high standards did not come out of the clear sky. They are the result of generations of struggle, effort, sacrifice, and initiative by both labor and industry. They represent the progress of America in the arts and sciences of production and enlightened, forward-looking government. They are not only unprecedented but unequaled in any other nation in the world. These high standards of wages and living must be zealously conserved and protected. It must be abundantly clear that if we would retain the integrity of these great and most beneficent social gains which have redounded to the betterment of our people and Nation, we cannot permit an influx of cheaply produced foreign goods to glut the American market, imperil our industries and create widespread industrial unemployment.

This does not mean that we shall turn our backs on the rest of the world and refuse to trade with friendly nations. To the contrary we must seek to build our foreign trade encouraging the importation of goods we need without dislocating our own industries and encouraging export of goods other nations need without injuring their internal productive economies. Let us trade with others when we

can do so to our advantage and when we can do so without inflicting harm, damage, and detriment to American industries. By the same token, let other nations trade with us when they profitably can, although frankly I can see nothing but temporary transient gain and ultimately a great deal of harm in the current situation wherein the United States is giving billions of dollars to foreign nations to enable them to purchase American goods. Such a policy may be justified in order to try to expedite economic and social recovery of the so-called democratic world but it can never be the basis for enduring and mutually profitable trade relations between ourselves and other nations.

Under this bill our choices are limited. We can vote for the motion to recommit which in effect, if sustained, would continue the present reciprocity program without change or amendment for 3 years. This course is entirely repugnant. We can vote against the bill in its entirety, and this course, since it would inflict a crushing blow to the whole recovery program, is undesirable and to my mind unwise. We can vote for the present bill with its obvious infirmities but with its assurance of some discoverable protection for our working people and our industries in a world of shattered, broken standards and values for 1 year. At the expiration of this time we should, and probably will have to, revise and revamp our trade policies in keeping with domestic and foreign developments.

This bill gives to the Congress more definite control over our commercial relations and tariff needs. It continues for only 1 year. It makes, I think, for stability and order in our own productive system as well as in our foreign trade relations and assists the foreign recovery program. I will therefore vote for this bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, the principles of the trade-agreements program that has been carried out over the past few years, in my opinion, has not only created good relations with other countries but it has been as Secretary Marshall so well said "a cornerstone of our foreign economic policy." It is my definite opinion that this measure will seriously handicap our stock-piling program here in America, and this program, at the present time, is in a very critical state. I am hopeful that before this measure becomes law we will be able to work out a bill that will extend the trade agreements for at least 3 years, and I am opposed to this measure in its present form.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey made some mention of the United States State Department recognizing an agreement made with Czechoslovakia. I call the attention of the Members to the fact that the agreement was made in concert with more than 20 other nations before the Czech Government went behind the iron curtain, that we still have diplomatic relations with that country, and that we were in duty bound to honor that agreement the same as all other nations signatory to that agreement have done. So do not let that have any effect upon your judgment in this case.

Now let me refer to the remarks of the gentleman from New York who mentioned the letter of the Secretary of State. We all have the highest respect for that gentleman. But I am sure we must recognize it is the duty of the Secretary of State when an inquiry is made of him as to his opinion of the effect of a particular measure up for consideration by the Congress to give his opinion as he sees it. That is what the Secretary of State did in this instance when he stated that this bill would be worse than no law at all. I also wish I had the same confidence as the gentleman from New York with respect to the attitude of the next Congress, whether it be Republican or Democratic. He said he had all the faith in the world that the Republican Congress would continue this reciprocal trade agreements program—and he believed it. But, Mr. Chairman, the record of the Republican Congress certainly does not bear that out. Attention has been called repeatedly on the floor of the House to the record of the Republican Members of the House to the vote initiating this program and the vote on the question of renewing it. Republicans voted 30 and 40 to 1 against the program. I also call attention to the fact that the ranking members of the majority party on the Ways and Means Committee have repeatedly voted against this program. Therefore, I think the confidence of the gentleman from New York is very much misplaced when he says he believes that the next Congress, if it be Republican, will continue this program of reciprocal trade agreements in full force and effect.

Mr. Chairman, why this sudden change on the part of these Members who heretofore opposed this program? Why these protestations that this is only an extension with minor alterations? Why these declarations of support for an extension? I believe those Members who are saying that to you today have the same opinion in certain respects, as I have. They know it will be practically impossible to negotiate a single program within the next year during the life of this extension because of the restrictions imposed, because of the red tape imposed, and because of the change in the body which will make recommendations to the Congress. A question was asked of the chairman of the present Tariff Commission, how much time it would take the Tariff Commission to do the same job as was done at Geneva by the body which had charge of these matters, and he said it would require 2 years or more. That is the answer of the present chairman of the Tariff Commission. In the 1947 report the Tariff Commission said it did not now have the number of employees they need to take care of the work they already are obligated to do.

Mr. Chairman, even under the most favorable circumstances, with no study, survey, or investigation, it will take 1 year for the Tariff Commission to make a report. By that time, the law will have expired. Remember, the President can only start to negotiate with foreign countries after he gets this report. Does that agree with the statements that have been made, to the effect that there are only minor alterations contained in this bill?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that I have talked with Mr. Will Clayton, who has made a very careful and thorough study of this matter. He tells me, as the gentleman has just said, that they cannot operate under this program.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said here and in the report that the Tariff Commission will make a study of the effect of proposed negotiations on the domestic economy. There is nothing in the bill about that. The only reference is to domestic producers. It does not say a word about domestic economy in this bill. I hope the membership will vote the bill down.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I have voted against the reciprocal trade agreements on every occasion. I voted against them at their inception. I knew then, and I know now that these trade agreements were born in the fertile brain of our international manufacturers and bankers—the economic royalists.

When these reciprocal trade agreements were brought up for the first time in Congress in 1934, the international bankers and manufacturers were out in the open. They boldly proclaimed that in order to collect what foreign nations owed us, we would have to surrender our local market to these nations until these foreign debts were liquidated. They did not, however, tell us that they were to make a profit. They did not tell us that the farmer, the laborer, and the small producers would be made the shock absorbers.

Every reciprocal trade agreement that has been made since the inception of these laws was made in favor of the international bankers and manufacturers. In every such agreement the farmer, the laborer, and the small-business man was sold down the river.

These agreements were the forerunner of the international conference held recently, where the foreign horse traders, with the consent and acquiescence of our Government, decided that the farmer's maximum price on wheat should be $1.10 per bushel. In other words, the farmer's throat was cut by some 31 foreign nations fixing the price at which his product was to be sold to them.

I find no fault with the Members representing General Motors, the automobile manufacturers, General Electric, and other international manufacturers, and

those representing the international bankers, for feeling that they must vote for some kind of reciprocal trade agreement. These agreements are in line with the present policy of our executive department of depleting America of its resources. They are in line with the slogan, "Foreigners preferred—Americans forgotten."

I shall vote against the motion to recommit, which would continue the present un-American policy, and then I shall vote against even 1 year's extension. I think this un-American legislation—legislation the object of which is to reduce the American standard of living—should be allowed to die a disgraceful death on June 30.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this bill. I would not do so for 1 minute, however, if I believed that it meant the scuttling of the reciprocal trade program.

Although I realize that there are those in Congress who are not in sympathy with the basic program, I feel that it has become an integral part of our foreign policy and that it is decidedly in our economic, as well as our international interest to continue it.

For that reason it seems to me extremely unfortunate that the Secretary of State, under whose distinguished military leadership I was privileged and proud to serve, has seen fit to make a statement in substance that he would rather have nothing, than the bill now proposed. His statement gives support to those who, for political motives only, argue that the passage of this bill evidences an intention on the part of the majority party to pursue a policy of isolationism. There are many on this side who would oppose at every juncture any such move. It is simply not realistic in the face of modern conditions, and constantly improving methods of communication, resulting in shrunken oceans and contracted plains.

Although I can see the practical necessity for speeding up the legislative process at this late date, it is a matter of regret to me that this bill was brought before us under a closed rule, thus barring the discussion of proposed amendments, some of which might, in my judgment, substantially improve the measure. I felt it necessary to vote against the rule.

Under the situation which we now face, however, we must choose whether we will vote to continue this program for a little over a year with certain amendments, or vote to end it now. Let there be no mistake on that point. If this bill is defeated, it means the end of the entire reciprocal trade program on the 12th day of next June. I am unwilling to cast a vote which would have that result.

I would have been happy to see a 2-year extension of this program. Certainly it seems to me we should not depart from the policy pursued by the present minority party when it was in power, to have each Congress take a new look at the operations of the act and make such changes and improvements as appear desirable in the light of newly developed facts. Their about-face in this respect lends additional weight to the purely partisan character of the opposition.

On the whole, I incline toward the view that a 2-year extension would also give a greater opportunity for negotiation with foreign countries. On the other hand, there is much to commend the principle of a 1-year extension in two respects. In the first place, under the European recovery program, with which the principle of reciprocal trade is correlated, the so-called watchdog committee, which has been set up to survey the operations of the Economic Cooperation Administration, report to the Congress on its operations and make recommendations for changes, will presumably complete its first survey and file its findings during the next session of Congress. Thus the termination of the extended Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will coincide in time with the report to the Congress on this matter, so intimately tied up with the questions involved in international trade—a most natural and fortunate result.

In addition, the next Congress is to consider the charter of the International Trade Organization which, if adopted, will require legislation of a permanent character relating to our trade with other nations. At that time it will be essential that we review completely our present trade program and policies.

There have been abuses in the administration of the reciprocal trade program. Anyone who blinds himself to this fact shuts his eyes to reality. That it can be improved no one can doubt. It is to be hoped that such improvement will result from the terms of this bill. If that is not the result when the matter comes before Congress the next time, appropriate adjustment should be made.

In the meantime, it is suggested that those who are groping so frantically for a campaign issue, regrettably at the expense of presenting to the world an entirely false picture of the foreign policy envisioned in this legislation, ponder on the fact that it will be supported by many who have been in the forefront of those who recognize the international responsibilities of this Nation and advocate their fullest discharge.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, the debate on the rule and in favor of the passage of this resolution has convinced me, beyond doubt, that the Republican leadership of the House intends to sabotage the reciprocal trade program next year. They would do so now if it were not for the impending election.

All of the Republican leaders who advocate passage of this resolution are confirmed foes of the Reciprocal Trade Act which has been in operation some 14 years. Their voting record is clear proof of their hostility. Why then should we now assume that it is their present intention to strengthen existing law? Is this our first experience with the majority leadership in the crippling and emasculating of legislation?

This course of action has been repeated so often in the Eightieth Congress that only the uninformed can be misled. This is the same old pattern of doing by indirection that which they do not have the courage to do directly. Republican leaders are aware that the great majority of the American people are in favor of extending the reciprocal-trade program for another 2 or 3 years. With that knowledge Republican leaders, serving special interests, dare not take too drastic action before the coming election. Therefore we have before us the present resolution extending the time period until just a few months after election.

I say to you that this is booby-trap legislation and that the time bomb is set to explode after election. An aroused press and radio should so inform the public. Under proper leadership an aroused people will give their answer in clear and unmistakable terms next November. Mr. Chairman, at long last the majority leadership has overreached itself.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we come now to the close of the debate on this bill, debate which is based upon these hearings, this voluminous book of hearings, held before our committee, starting in March 1947; hearings which are most complete with respect to both sides of this question of reciprocity agreements.

At the moment the House has before it a measure which will, for time to come, take from its present partisan administration this great question of foreign trade. Hereafter both great political parties will approve it as a permanent policy.

This bill presently considered represents the position of the Republican Party, a policy which, incidentally, is based upon the policy of reciprocity in foreign trade agreements, dating from away back in the twenties.

Anyone who says that the proposal made in the Gearhart bill cannot work is, in effect, saying that only one man in this country has the ability or power to effect proper foreign trade agreements, for all we do basically in this bill is to take back from the Executive the authority to, under any and all circumstances, make trade agreements. All we do is to say that under certain clearly defined circumstances, you, Mr. President, must come back to the Congress, and the Congress then determines whether to follow your plan or not.

The Tariff Commission, a highly respected organization and representative of the legislative branch of the Government, will have authority to set the limits within which the President may act. That, I believe, is a highly desirable condition, and does give protection to industry.

The only possible argument made today which might have substantial weight or raise a question in the minds of some of us, is the effect of this bill upon the international picture, specifically, as to whether or not the European recovery program can properly operate under this bill. I can point to statements made before our committee in executive session by Secretary Marshall and by Mr. Clayton, that there is nothing whatever

in the European Recovery Act, presently the law of this land, which says that the international trade agreements must be based upon this particular legislation. Specifically, the act says that the countries shall seek agreements to eliminate barriers. There is no specific requirement as to method. I urge complete approval of this bill. Vote for this legislation and you will assure the continuance of a true reciprocal trade policy.

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

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Nothing that we do today will affect any existing treaties?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Every present agreement will continue, regardless of what we do here today.

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

All time has expired.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and that all Members who have not spoken but who desire to extend their remarks may have five legislative days within which to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The latter part of the gentleman's request must be made in the House. The first part of the gentleman's request has already been granted.

The bill (H. R. 6556) is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign-trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1351), is hereby extended until the close of June 30, 1949.

SEC. 2. Before entering into negotiations concerning any proposed foreign-trade agreement authorized by section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the President shall furnish the United States Tariff Commission (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "Commission") with a list of all articles imported into the United States to be considered for the possible granting of concessions in the agreement and shall request the Commission to make an investigation and to report to him the findings of the Commission as to—

(1) the extent to which duties and other import restrictions on the articles included in the list may be modified; or

(2) the extent to which additional import restrictions on the articles included in the list may be imposed; or

(3) the maximum periods (if any) for which obligations may be undertaken to continue existing customs or excise treatment of articles included in the list,

in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350 without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles or impairing the national defense. No such foreign trade agreement shall be entered into until the Commission has made its report to the President.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall furnish facts, statistics, and other information at its command to officers and employees of the United States preparing for or participating in the negotiation of any foreign trade agreement; but neither the Commission nor any member, officer, or employee of the Commission shall participate in any manner (except to furnish information) in the making of decisions with respect to proposed terms of any foreign trade agreement or in the negotiation of any such agreement.

(b) In the course of any investigation pursuant to a request of the President under subsection (a) of this section the Commission shall hold hearings and give reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

(c) Section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930", approved June 12, 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1354), is hereby amended by striking out "the United States Tariff Commission,", by striking out "War, Navy,", and by inserting "the National Military Establishment," after "Commerce,".

SEC. 4. (a) If the President enters into any foreign trade agreement with any foreign government or instrumentality thereof under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which requires, or pursuant to which it would be appropriate for, him to make a proclamation modifying any existing duty or other import restriction or imposing any additional import restriction to an extent greater than that reported to him by the Commission pursuant to section 2, or continuing existing customs or excise treatment of articles beyond the time specified by the Commission in its report to him pursuant to section 2—

(1) the President shall transmit such agreement (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a message which shall include his views with respect to the provisions of such agreement which require, or pursuant to which it would be appropriate for, him to make such a proclamation. The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session;

(2) the Commission shall deposit with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, a copy of its report to the President with respect to such foreign trade agreement;

(3) such foreign trade agreement shall not take effect before the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the foreign trade agreement is transmitted to it; and such foreign trade agreement shall thereafter take effect only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the foreign trade agreement.

(b) For the purposes of subsection (a) (3)—

(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournement of the Congress sine die; but

(2) in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain; except that if a resolution (as defined in section 202) with respect to such foreign trade agreement has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no exclusion under this paragraph shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

SEC. 5. (a) The second sentence of section 350 (a) (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "No proclamation shall be made (A) decreasing by more than 50 percent any rate of duty, however established, existing on January 1, 1945 (even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress), (B) increasing by more than 50 percent any rate of duty, however established, existing on June 12, 1934 (even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress), or (C) transferring any article between the dutiable and free lists."

(b) The proviso of subsection (b) of such section is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That the duties on such an article shall in no case (1) be decreased by more than 50 percent of the duties, however established, existing on January 1, 1945 (even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress), or (2) be increased by more than 50 percent of the duties, however established, existing on June 12, 1934 (even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress)".

(c) Subsection (d) of such section is hereby amended by striking out "increased or" and by striking out "increase or".

SEC. 6. Title II of the Reorganization Act of 1945 (Public Law 263, Seventy-ninth Congress) shall apply with respect to concurrent resolutions expressing disapproval of foreign trade agreements transmitted to the Congress by the President pursuant to section 4 of this act in the same manner and to the same extent as such title applies with respect to concurrent resolutions expressing disapproval of reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress by the President; but references in such title to "reorganization plan" or "plan" shall, for the purpose of this section, be considered to refer to "foreign trade agreement" or "agreement", respectively.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to inquire if the Committee on Ways and Means has any amendments to offer to the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. There are no amendments, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of New York, 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. 6556) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 608, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. In its present form, I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 6556) 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, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the period during which the President is author-

ized to enter into foreign-trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended, is hereby extended for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1948."

Mr. KNUTSON. 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. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 168, nays 211, answering "present" 1, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—168

Abbitt	Fallon	Manasco
Abernethy	Feighan	Mansfield
Albert	Fernandez	Marcantonio
Allen, La	Flannagan	Meade, Md.
Andrews, Ala.	Fogarty	Merrow
Bakewell	Folger	Mills
Barden	Forand	Monroney
Bates, Ky.	Fulton	Morgan
Battle	Garmatz	Morris
Beckworth	Gary	Morton
Bland	Gathings	Multer
Blatnik	Gordon	Murdock
Bloom	Gore	Murray, Tenn.
Boggs, La.	Gorski	Norrell
Bonner	Grant, Ala.	Norton
Boykin	Gregory	O'Brien
Brooks	Hardy	O'Toole
Brown, Ga.	Harless, Ariz.	Pace
Bryson	Harris	Passman
Buchanan	Harrison	Patman
Buckley	Hart	Peden
Burleson	Havenner	Pickett
Byrne, N. Y.	Hays	Poage
Camp	Hébert	Poulson
Cannon	Hedrick	Powell
Carroll	Hendricks	Preston
Celler	Heselton	Price, Fla.
Chadwick	Hobbs	Price, Ill.
Chapman	Huber	Priest
Chelf	Isacson	Rains
Clark	Jackson, Calif.	Rankin
Clason	Jackson, Wash.	Redden
Colmer	Jarman	Richards
Combs	Javits	Rooney
Cooley	Jenkins, Pa.	Sabath
Cooper	Jones, Ala.	Sadowski
Corbett	Judd	Sasscer
Courtney	Karsten, Mo.	Sikes
Cox	Kee	Smathers
Cravens	Kelley	Smith, Va.
Crosser	Kennedy	Spence
Davis, Ga.	Keogh	Stanley
Davis, Tenn.	Kerr	Teague
Deane	Kirwan	Thomas, Tex.
Delaney	Klein	Thompson
Devitt	Lanham	Trimble
Dingell	Lesinski	Vinson
Domengeaux	Lodge	Walter
Donohue	Lucas	Welch
Dorn	Ludlow	Wheeler
Doughton	Lynch	Whitaker
Douglas	McCormack	Whitten
Durham	McDonough	Whittington
Eberharter	McMillan, S. C.	Winstead
Elliott	Madden	Wood
Evins	Mahon	Worley

NAYS—211

Allen, Calif.	Bolton	Cole, Kans.
Allen, Ill.	Bradley	Cole, Mo.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bramblett	Cole, N. Y.
Andresen, August H.	Brehm	Coudert
Andrews, N. Y.	Brophy	Crawford
Angell	Brown, Ohio	Crow
Arends	Buck	Cunningham
Arnold	Buffett	Curtis
Auchincloss	Burke	Dague
Banta	Busbey	Davis, Wis.
Barrett	Butler	Dawson, Utah
Bates, Mass.	Byrnes, Wis.	D'Ewart
Beall	Canfield	Dirksen
Bender	Carson	Dondero
Bennett, Mich.	Case, N. J.	Eaton
Bennett, Mo.	Case, S. Dak.	Ellis
Bishop	Chenoweth	Ellsworth
Blackney	Chiperfield	Elsaesser
Boggs, Del.	Church	Elston
	Clevenger	Engel, Mich.
	Coffin	Fellows
Fenton	Kilburn	Rich
Fisher	Knutson	Riehlman
Fletcher	Kunkel	Rizley
Foote	Latham	Rockwell
Fuller	Lea	Rogers, Fla.
Gallagher	LeCompte	Rogers, Mass.
Gavin	LeFevre	Rohrbough
Gearhart	Lemke	Ross
Gillette	Lewis, Ky.	Russell
Gillie	Lewis, Ohio	Sadlak
Goff	Lichtenwalter	St. George
Goodwin	Love	Sanborn
Gossett	McConnell	Sarbacher
Graham	McCowen	Schwabe, Mo.
Granger	McCulloch	Schwabe, Okla.
Grant, Ind.	McDowell	Scott, Hardie
Griffiths	McGarvey	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Gross	McGregor	Scrivner
Hagen	McMahon	Seely-Brown
Hale	McMillen, Ill.	Shafer
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mack	Simpson, Ill.
Hall, Leonard W.	MacKinnon	Simpson, Pa.
Hand	Macy	Smith, Kans.
Harness, Ind.	Maloney	Smith, Ohio
Harvey	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Wis.
Herter	Mason	Snyder
Hess	Mathews	Stefan
Hill	Meyer	Stevenson
Hinshaw	Michener	Stockman
Hoeven	Miller, Conn.	Stratton
Hoffman	Miller, Md.	Sundstrom
Holmes	Miller, Nebr.	Taber
Hope	Mitchell	Talle
Horan	Muhlenberg	Taylor
Hull	Nicholson	Tibbott
Jenison	Nixon	Tollefson
Jenkins, Ohio	Nodar	Towe
Jennings	Norblad	Twyman
Jensen	O'Konski	Vail
Johnson, Calif.	Patterson	Van Zandt
Johnson, Ill.	Philbin	Vorys
Johnson, Ind.	Phillips, Calif.	Vursell
Jones, Wash.	Phillips, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Jonkman	Ploeser	Weichel
Kean	Plumley	Wigglesworth
Kearney	Potts	Wilson, Ind.
Kearns	Ramey	Wolcott
Keating	Reed, Ill.	Wolverton
Keefe	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
	Rees	Youngblood
	Reeves	

ANSWERING "PRESENT"—1

Halleck

NOT VOTING—51

Anderson, Calif.	Kefauver	Pfeifer
Bell	Kersten, Wis.	Potter
Bulwinkle	Kilday	Rayburn
Clippinger	King	Regan
Cotton	Landis	Riley
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Rivers
Dolliver	Larcade	Robertson
Engle, Calif.	Lusk	Scoblick
Gamble	Lyle	Sheppard
Gwinn, N. Y.	Meade, Ky.	Short
Gwynne, Iowa	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Maine
Hartley	Morrison	Somers
Heffernan	Mundt	Stigler
Holifield	Murray, Wis.	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, Okla.	O'Hara	West
Johnson, Tex.	Owens	Williams
Jones N. C.	Peterson	Wilson, Tex.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rayburn for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. King for, with Mrs. Smith of Maine against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

Mr. Kefauver for, with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Dolliver against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Gwinn of New York against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Anderson of California against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Potter against.

Mr. Wilson of Texas for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Johnson of Texas for, with Mr. Owens against.

Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Cotton against.

Mr. Stigler for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Mr. Somers for, with Mr. Scoblick against.

Mrs. Lusk for, with Mr. Meade of Kentucky against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Kilday.

Mr. Mundt with Mr. Riley.

Mr. Landis with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. Lyle.

Mr. VURSELL changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CANNON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I have a pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RAYBURN, who is unavoidably detained. If he were present, he would have voted "aye." I have voted "no." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on that we demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nays 149, answering "present" 1, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—234

Allen, Calif.	Eaton	Keating
Allen, Ill.	Elliott	Keefe
Andersen, H. Carl	Ellis	Kilburn
Andresen, August H.	Ellsworth	Knutson
Andrews, N. Y.	Elsaesser	Kunkel
Angell	Elston	Larcade
Arends	Engel, Mich.	Latham
Arnold	Fellows	Lea
Auchincloss	Fenton	LeCompte
Bakewell	Fisher	LeFevre
Banta	Fletcher	Lewis, Ky.
Barrett	Foote	Lewis, Ohio
Bates, Mass.	Fuller	Lichtenwalter
Beall	Fulton	Lodge
Bender	Gallagher	Love
Bennett, Mich.	Gathings	McConnell
Bennett, Mo.	Gavin	McCowen
Bishop	Gearhart	McCulloch
Blackney	Gillette	McDonough
Bland	Gillie	McDowell
Boggs, Del.	Goff	McGarvey
Bolton	Goodwin	McGregor
Bradley	Gossett	McMahon
Bramblett	Graham	McMillen, Ill.
Brehm	Granger	Mack
Brophy	Grant, Ind.	MacKinnon
Brown, Ohio	Griffiths	Macy
Buck	Gross	Maloney
Buffett	Hagen	Martin, Iowa
Burke	Hale	Mason
Busbey	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mathews
Butler	Hall, Leonard W.	Meade, Md.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hand	Merrow
Canfield	Harness, Ind.	Meyer
Carson	Harvey	Michener
Case, N. J	Hébert	Miller, Conn.
Case, S. Dak.	Herter	Miller, Md.
Chadwick	Heselton	Miller, Nebr.
Chenoweth	Hess	Mitchell
Chiperfield	Hill	Morton
Church	Hinshaw	Muhlenberg
Clason	Hoeven	Nicholson
Clevenger	Hoffman	Nixon
Coffin	Holmes	Nodar
Cole, Kans.	Hope	Norblad
Cole, Mo.	Horan	Passman
Cole, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Patterson
Corbett	Javits	Philbin
Coudert	Jenison	Phillips, Calif.
Crawford	Jenkins, Ohio	Phillips, Tenn.
Crow	Jenkins, Pa.	Ploeser
Cunningham	Jennings	Plumley
Curtis	Jensen	Potts
Dague	Johnson, Calif.	Poulson
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Ill.	Ramey
Dawson, Utah	Johnson, Ind.	Reed, Ill.
Devitt	Jones, Wash.	Reed, N. Y.
D'Ewart	Jonkman	Rees
Dirksen	Judd	Reeves
Domengeaux	Kean	Rich
Dondero	Kearney	Riehlman
Donohue	Kearns	Rizley
		Rockwell
		Rogers, Mass.

Rohrbough	Simpson, Ill.	Twyman
Ross	Simpson, Pa.	Vail
Russell	Smith, Kans.	Van Zandt
Sadlak	Smith, Wis.	Vorys
St. George	Snyder	Vursell
Sanborn	Stefan	Wadsworth
Sarbacher	Stevenson	Welch
Schwabe, Mo.	Stockman	Whitten
Schwabe, Okla.	Stratton	Wigglesworth
Scoblick	Sundstrom	Wilson, Ind.
Scott, Hardie	Taber	Winstead
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Talle	Wolcott
	Taylor	Wolverton
Scrivner	Tibbott	Woodruff
Seely-Brown	Tollefson	Youngblood
Shafer	Towe	

NAYS—149

Abbitt	Flannagan	Morgan
Abernethy	Fogarty	Morris
Albert	Folger	Multer
Allen, La.	Forand	Murdock
Andrews, Ala.	Garmatz	Murray, Tenn.
Barden	Gary	Norrell
Bates, Ky.	Gordon	Norton
Battle	Gore	O'Brien
Beckworth	Gorski	O'Konski
Blatnik	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Bloom	Gregory	Pace
Boggs, La.	Hardy	Patman
Bonner	Harless, Ariz.	Peden
Boykin	Harris	Peterson
Brooks	Harrison	Pickett
Brown, Ga.	Hart	Poage
Bryson	Havenner	Powell
Buchanan	Hays	Preston
Buckley	Hedrick	Price, Fla.
Burleson	Hendricks	Price, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hobbs	Priest
Camp	Huber	Rains
Cannon	Hull	Rankin
Carroll	Isacson	Redden
Celler	Jackson, Wash.	Regan
Chapman	Jarman	Richards
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Clark	Karsten, Mo.	Rooney
Colmer	Kee	Sabath
Combs	Kelley	Sadowski
Cooley	Kennedy	Sasscer
Cooper	Keogh	Sikes
Courtney	Kerr	Smathers
Cox	Kirwan	Smith, Ohio
Cravens	Klein	Smith, Va.
Crosser	Lanham	Spence
Davis, Ga.	Lemke	Stanley
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Teague
Deane	Lucas	Thomas, Tex.
Delaney	Ludlow	Thompson
Dingell	Lynch	Trimble
Dorn	McCormack	Vinson
Doughton	McMillan, S. C.	Walter
Douglas	Madden	Weichel
Durham	Mahon	Wheeler
Eberharter	Manasco	Whitaker
Evins	Mansfield	Whittington
Fallon	Marcantonio	Wood
Feighan	Mills	Worley
Fernandez	Monroney	

ANSWERING "PRESENT"—1

Halleck

NOT VOTING—47

Anderson, Calif.	Jones, N. C.	Pfeifer
Bell	Kefauver	Potter
Bulwinkle	Kersten, Wis.	Rayburn
Clippinger	Kilday	Riley
Cotton	King	Rivers
Dawson, Ill.	Landis	Robertson
Dolliver	Lane	Sheppard
Engle, Calif.	Lusk	Short
Gamble	Lyle	Smith, Maine
Gwinn, N. Y.	Meade, Ky.	Somers
Gwynne, Iowa	Miller, Calif.	Stigler
Hartley	Morrison	Thomas, N. J.
Heffernan	Mundt	West
Holifield	Murray, Wis.	Williams
Johnson, Okla.	O'Hara	Wilson, Tex.
Johnson, Tex.	Owens	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Rayburn against.

Mr. Lyle for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Gwynne of Iowa for, with Mrs. Lusk against.

Mr. Wilson of Texas for, with Mr. Somers against.

Mr. Gwinn of New York for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Cotton for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Riley against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Kilday.

Mr. Mundt with Mr. West.

Mr. Landis with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Owens with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. Bulwinkle.

Mr. BROOKS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I have a pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RAYBURN, who is unavoidably detained. I voted "yea." I understand if the gentleman from Texas had been present he would have voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday we are going to bring up the tax-revision bill. For the information of the House, I desire to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a synopsis of the measure, which contains 150 pages.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves to instruct the managers on the part of the House to agree in conference to Senate amendment No. 33——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan——

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the withdrawal of the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's objection comes too late. The Chair had already recognized the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] may extend his remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence be granted to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] for 4 days, to attend the funeral of a relative.

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

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT SYSTEM

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6407) to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLVERTON, HINSHAW, LEONARD W. HALL, LEA, and PRIEST.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1641) entitled "An act to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the foregoing bill, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. HILL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

WOMEN'S CORPS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SHAFER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. GEARHART) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it may exceed the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. RUSSELL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by him.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY ON AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. What is the status of the agricultural appropriation bill, messaged over from the Senate with Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. The bill is now on the Speaker's table awaiting action.

The Chair wishes to state that the Chair has been given assurance by Members on both sides of the House that nothing of a controversial character would be taken up during the balance of the day. When the gentleman from Missouri offered his motion, it was obvious there was to be controversy concerning it and the Chair therefore had the gentleman from Illinois withdraw his request.

Mr. CANNON. But, Mr. Speaker, a conference had already been granted; the House had disagreed to the Senate amendments and agreed to the conference asked by the Senate. The Speaker had handed the names of the conferees to the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asked that his request be withdrawn and nobody objected. The request was withdrawn.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, before the Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia last Saturday.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein letters from the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, and documents; and I ask that I may include these matters even though they should exceed the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain newspaper excerpts.

Mr. KEFAUVER (at the request of Mr. HARLESS of Arizona) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of railroad retirement pensions.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 30 minutes today following the other special orders heretofore entered for today.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Joint Resolutions 412 and 413.

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

There was no objection.

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.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY BOARD

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5874) to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes, with 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 2, lines 4 and 5, strike out "and the Architect of the Capitol." and insert "and a third person not employed by the Federal or District Governments who shall be appointed by the Chairman of the District of Columbia Committees of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives for a term of 3 years."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to consider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 615, Rept. No. 2052), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED ALCOHOL PLANTS AT MUSCATINE, IOWA, KANSAS CITY, MO., AND OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 597 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6096) to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides consideration for H. R. 6096, a bill making certain Government-owned alcohol plants available to the Department of Agriculture. The plants concerned are located at Muscatine, Iowa; Kansas City, Mo.; and Omaha, Nebr.

These plants, which manufacture alcohol from grain and other agricultural products, were built by the Government during the war, and they played an important part in providing industrial alcohol for synthetic rubber and for other essential war uses. The War Production Board continued to operate the plants until 1946, when they were turned over

to the Department of Agriculture, which operated the plants until the middle of last year. In March 1947, however, the Department of Agriculture notified the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that it had no objection to the termination of the alcohol-feed leases of the two largest plants—at Kansas City and Omaha. And in July 1947, both plants were formally declared surplus. The War Assets Administration received bids on the plants. But while negotiations for sale were in progress, the Committee on Agriculture asked that disposal of the plants be deferred until June 30, 1948.

Last January, the Secretary submitted a bill to authorize the transfer of the plant at Muscatine, Iowa, to the Department of Agriculture. He did not ask to have the two larger plants retained—but the Committee on Agriculture thought the best interests of the country could be served by retaining Government ownership of all three of the plants—and the commitee reported this bill for that purpose.

This is a simple rule, which merely provides consideration of, and 1 hour of debate on the bill. In view of the present unsettled world conditions, the Rules Committee thought this bill was of sufficient urgency to warrant immediate consideration. Unless the bill is acted upon by June 30, the plants will be sold as surplus. Therefore, it is important that we adopt this resolution, and proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. We have no requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 6096) be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection?

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of assuring their operation for the production of products from agriculture commodities in order to provide a means of discharging the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture in connection with surplus agricultural commodities, research, and other authorized activities, and to assist in providing an adequate supply of alcohol and other products produced from agricultural commodities necessary for the national defense, (1) the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as successor to Defense Plant Corporation, shall transfer, without regard to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and without reimbursement or transfer of funds, to the Secretary of Agriculture all of its right, title, and interest in and to the alcohol plant established and constructed by Defense Plant Corporation at Muscatine, Iowa, the property, together with the equipment, records, facilities, and other property appurtenant thereto; and (2) the War Assets Administration shall transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture without regard to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and without reimbursement or transfer of funds the alcohol plants at Kansas City, Mo,, and Omaha, Nebr., together with the land, equipment, facilities, and other property appurtenant thereto.

SEC. 2. In carrying out the purposes of this act the Secretary is authorized, upon such terms and conditions as he deems reasonable, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law—

(a) to provide for the operation of such plants by lease or other arrangement;

(b) to operate such plants, where disposal to, or operation by, others will not, in the judgment of the Secretary, accomplish the purpose of this act.

Such plants may be operated in the furtherance of any authorized activities of the Department of Agriculture, and any sale, lease, or other arrangement may be upon such terms and conditions as to result in the plant being operated for such purposes.

SEC. 3. Whenever the Secretary finds that the operation of any plant or plants as provided in this act is no longer necessary or desirable, he shall report such fact to Congress with his recommendations for the disposition thereof.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized (a) to construct and provide additional facilities and equipment necessary to the operation of such plants, and to maintain, repair, and alter such plants; (b) to acquire property or rights or interest therein by purchase, lease, gift, transfer, condemnation, or otherwise; (c) to incur necessary administrative expenses, including personal services; and (d) to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture shall assume all obligations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation covering operations of the Muscatine, Iowa, plant, equipment, facilities, and appurtenant property outstanding at the date of transfer.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 1, strike out "disposal to, or."

Page 3, line 2, after the word "by", strike out the comma.

Page 3, line 6, strike out the word "sale."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this is a subject that I have followed since before the war and I am well informed on it. I am sure that by reading a brief statement it will cover the subject matter. However, I shall be glad to answer any questions any Member desires to ask.

The three alcohol plants are the result of a congressional objective to provide the United States with, first, a strategic material for the manufacture of synthetic rubber, munitions, and supplemental fuels; second, facilities to use surplus or deteriorating agricultural commodities by converting them into storable materials and feeds; and third, demonstration and research units to ultimately expand the industrial use of farm products and to show that a farm program based on expanded economic use is much better than an acreage reduction or scarcity program.

These objectives are set out in various documents including the report of Bernard Baruch to the President of the United States (1942), Senate Document No. 240, Seventy-eighth Congress, Second session, Senate Document No. 167, Seventy-ninth Congress, United States Department of Agriculture Miscellaneous Publication 327, and many others. All of the objectives which were involved in the authorization for construction of these plants are valid today—even more so for it was thought then when peace arrived, there would be little for these plants to do except to be available for handling agricultural surpluses and perishables. Now that World War II is history and we try to look into the future, we find the possibility of more international entanglements, shortages of fuels—of rubber—of alcohol for synthetic rubber and munitions plus the certainty that if war comes again, agriculture will have to step into the supply of these materials, just as now it is the No. 1 industry in providing foods to make the peoples of the world peace makes the peoples of the world peace-

Yet only a few weeks ago two of these plants were about to be disposed of through the War Assets Administration and at least two of the bids offered contemplated the dismantling and junking of these plants allocation. The House Committee on Agriculture on January 16, 1948, requested that these bids be rejected and that no sale of these plants be made until after June 30, 1948. At that time the committee made inquiry of the Munitions Board concerning the interest of this board in these plants and asked if perchance it might want to exercise the so-called national-security clause which creates in all sales made by WAA in which this right is claimed, a dormant estate for the Government which would require the purchaser to maintain the plant for 20 years so that production of goods as produced for the war could be resumed in 120 days. The Board advised the committee it had no such interest, although recently it notified the RFC and the WAA that it was exercising the national-security clause provision. Thus, the Munitions Board now merely approves the action taken by the House Agriculture Committee unanimously and strengthens the reasons why the committee thought all three plants should be maintained in the Government.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. As one who has been intensely interested in this entire program throughout the years, may I say that I think the measure should pass. I believe it is a wise move, and I am in favor of it.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON] on his watchfulness on this important measure, and the good work of the Committee on Agriculture in taking the action contemplated in this proposed legislation, particularly in the interest of national defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, just today the Committee on Armed Services in the other body reported out a bill entitled, "To promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes." That is right along the lines of this bill. I have heard no objection from any source, and there just has not been any objection, so I shall not take further time now. This bill is well merited.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: On page 4, line 5, after the period add the following: "Also, the Secretary is authorized to use such sums from other appropriations or funds available to the bureaus, corporations, or agencies of the Department of Agriculture as he may deem necessary for expenses in connection with maintaining these plants in stand-by condition while not under lease."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. BROOKS Mr. Speaker, I am here by the command of a voice now stilled. Senator John Holmes Overton came to Washington in 1932 to represent the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana in the House of Representatives and a year later he came to Washington to represent in the Senate the entire State of Louisiana. He slipped out of this life into the Great Beyond in the early hours of Friday morning, May 14, following an operation at the Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md.

Senator Overton was my uncle. I knew him as a father. I saw him at work and at play, with his family and in public. I knew his secret hopes and his ambitions and I felt the vibrant enthusiasm of the joy of his successes. I was with him in the last hours of his life as he lay stricken in the hospital. I saw and talked to him immediately before the operation which was to lead to his death. I was the last person who talked business with him prior to his death. I know of his deep and fervent interest in flood control and river and harbor development which he maintained, with an unchecked zeal, even unto the hour of his death.

Senator Overton lived a vigorous, dynamic life and literally died, as he would have had it, with his boots on. There can be no doubt that the vigor with which he pushed his work in the United States hastened the end; but with a contagicus enthusiasm for his work, he pushed on toward the goals of safety and progress which he had set for those who dwell in the valleys of the Nation.

I was summoned to his bedside by the word of an emergency operation to be performed "within the hour." I arrived at the Naval Medical Center as he was about to be taken from his hospital bed to be removed to the operating room. A short delay in this procedure occurred as I stood beside his bed; and this gave me the opportunity of talking to our late friend and my uncle about the status of his work in the Senate. He was game and courageous to the last. As he faced the operation which he surely knew would bring on the end, he talked of flood control and of river development—the subjects of his constant work in the Senate. I tried to bring comfort to him with talk that this session of the Congress would soon end and that not a great deal of additional work would be handled before we adjourned. He quickly answered by referring to the fact that he would not be present when the Army Civil Functions bill containing moneys for flood control and for river development came up on the floor of the Senate. He referred to the fight which he thought must inevitably occur when the bill, after being adopted by the Senate, was sent to conference. He especially referred to the fact that he would be a conferee and that it was urgently important to be there to protect those projects which might, being perhaps not fully understood, become the subject of dispute. Whether they be works along the Ohio, the Sacramento, Missouri, Colorado, the Mississippi, or in any other part of the country, he was equally interested in them.

The last thing about which he talked was the Overton Red River lateral canal. It was his hope and dream for the development of the great southwestern empire in the valley of the Red River; and he said, "I want to live to carry on this work. Who is going to do this when I am not there?"

Of course, this was a most natural question, "Who is going to carry on—to push the work of river and valley development?" I am not discouraged or despondent, I know that this program is so vast and so appealing that champions of the cause of valle. development will arise; and, in fact, some have already arisen to carry forward this age-old fight for the development of our natural resources.

The question, of course, is what is going to happen to the program and who is going to take the leadership in pushing it to consummation? Soon, Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate conferees meet in session to decide upon the fate of the civil functions bill. They meet without Senator John Overton; but I cannot but believe that, while he will be absent in person, he will be there among those conferees and with his flood control in spirit as they meet and talk and decide these questions for submission back to the House and the Senate.

The fight in conference revolves about the question of whether we accept the figures of the Senate which are higher or whether we return to the lower figures of the House. The sum of about one hundred million dollars separates the two versions of this bill. All projects provided for in either version of the bill have been fully approved by the Congress and they all stand tiptoe at the door of the Appropriations Committee awaiting the allocations of funds with which to begin work.

At this juncture come the opponents of valley development and refer to the bill as a logrolling piece of legislation. Yes, opponents have come forward against even this fine type of constructive legislation. They arise to fight all progress, all effort to change and all effort to improve. They are the reactionaries of mankind. They stand in the way of all progress. They are the iconoclasts of the ages. They malign and tear down both the progressive project and those who sponsor it. Such it is in this case.

This bill as written by the Senate has been referred to as a "pork barrel" piece of legislation. Those there are who severely criticize it when they know each and every project for which money is provided has already received the sanction and approval of the Congress of the United States after a careful investigation by the Army engineers, committees of Congress, and the two bodies of Congress themselves. Not a single dollar for construction purposes is provided save for those projects which bear the stamp of legislative approval and approval by the Army engineers. We should therefore adopt the amendments added by the Senate and allow these development projects to proceed in an orderly manner to completion.

I, of course, am interested in the Red River Valley. It is the last great valley in the United States which has not claimed the attention of your Congress for extensive development. It is a valley which extends through four States and flanks the twelve-hundred-mile course of the Red River from the Colorado borders of Texas to its confluence with the Atchafalaya and Mississippi Rivers at Angola, La. It is in need of immediate and marked attention from this Congress. The waters of the Red River move downstream year after year from the far upper reaches to flood our people and destroy our property. They need the help of modern engineering that they may be curbed and kept within channel. We have such projects in this bill, and they are meritorious. I shall not list them here, as they are well-known to most of us.

Then, there is another project—the Overton Red River lateral canal project. This project is to take the devastating and unruly waters of the Red River and put them to the usual purpose of service to mankind. Yes, the project is to construct a lateral canal on the west bank of the Red River for use by barges and small boats. It will give access by water to the heart of the Southwest. It will provide a means whereby products such as oil, lumber, and other badly needed merchandise may be brought to the markets of the East and the West, relieving shortages and eliminating great transportation charges. This project has received the approval of the Army engineers, who show it is thoroughly justified economically and will pay out in a short time.

This project is worthy and meritorious. It should stand on its own merits. But more than this, the project should be

built as a monument to the work of Senator Overton. This is the time to begin the project; and when dedication comes, all of those communities throughout this Nation which have received the benefits of projects begun and constructed either in whole or in part by the efforts, energies, abilities, and genius of the late senior Senator from Louisiana should have part in its dedication.

But while I feel especially that this is the important time to begin the Overton Red River lateral canal, it is not this project alone for which I plead. I urge the approval by this Congress of all of those items placed by the Senate in the civil functions bill. I urge the approval of projects along the Mississippi River in the vicinity of New Orleans, Vicksburg, Memphis, and St. Louis. I urge the continuation of work along the Calcasieu, the Ohio, and in the Missouri River Valley, along the Sabine-Neches, Arkansas, and White Rivers, in New England, in the Pacific area and, in fact, throughout the country where such projects have been approved by the Army engineers and endorsed by this Congress. The great Mississippi Valley, the most fertile and perhaps the most populous valley in the entire world, bears a tremendous burden of water to the sea. In accordance with the volume of the water have come great problems which arise for solution. I make this plea that our program for flood control and rivers and harbors development may go forward without abatement; and that it may be pushed fast enough that we may see the fruition of our work during our lifetime and while the present generation may enjoy the benefits of them.

They tell us that this program of internal development is too costly. They tell us that we must cut from the bill projects which are very worthy, highly desirable and are badly needed by the peoples of this country. They make this statement in the face of the fact that we have expended billions of dollars to rehabilitate Europe and the Orient and have set up a 5-year program for continued expenditures reaching astronomical proportions. In this bill we ask only for $708,000,000 which, if need be, could be taken from the foreign program without seriously jeopardizing it. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to do this. Ample funds can be found among our own revenues dedicated to internal development and rehabilitation. Money thus expended is used for the building up and the increasing of the resources of this Nation. It is not money thrown away or improvidently expended. It is in effect money placed in the bank of national welfare subject to withdrawal when hard times come and a rainy day faces the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the cause of flood control and navigation has been dealt a heavy blow—but it is not a mortal blow. It is a program so vast and complicated that it will require years—perhaps a hundred years—for its completion. It is a program which goes back for its beginning to the shades of history. Ancient Babylon and Egypt saw the waters of the Euphrates and the Nile Rivers annually overflow, destroying crops, people, and cities. These people determined even at this early date in the annals of history to take national action to curb this annual menace and harness these flood waters to a useful purpose. Year by year this program advanced, forming, as far as I know, the first major programs of flood control in the history of the world. The ancient civilizations of both of these countries are gone; but the great cause of flood control and valley developments, ruing the effects of time and tide, moves on down through the ages to the Eightieth Congress. It is one of the real benefactors of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have a deathbed mandate from John Overton to discharge. In all humility, I feel the paucity of my ability to meet this responsibility; but the cause for which I fight gives me the strength and the temerity to carry on and emboldens me to urge that this Congress accept the full recommendations of the Senate bill with its increases for old projects and its addition of new ones. Let us march forward in a spirit of confidence and not in the attitude of defeatism.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] for 30 minutes.

HOUSING OR LOG JAMMING?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, since May 3 my colleagues and I on the Banking and Currency Committee have been hearing testimony and giving consideration to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, S. 866, the comprehensive housing bill which came over to us on April 26 after passage by the Senate. At the outset of those hearings I was gratified and encouraged when the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], assured the members of the committee that it was his purpose to get a bill reported out as quickly as possible in order to insure enactment before Congress adjourns. Here, at least, after 4 years of exhaustive study by Congress, it appeared that this House would have an opportunity to vote on comprehensive housing legislation, the need for which has been emphasized time and again in the findings of bipartisan committees of Congress and which, on two different occasions, has been passed by the Senate.

I quote from the statement of the chairman opening the hearings:

> It is our purpose to have adequate hearings, though not prolonged to the point where they will defeat our purpose by delaying action. It is not our purpose to delay action on this bill. It is our purpose to get a bill reported out just as quickly as we possibly can in order to insure that it might be enacted before Congress adjourns.

It is now the last of May. Where is the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill today? It is still bottled up in committee.

On Monday, May 24, when the Banking and Currency Committee resumed its hearings after a lapse of a week, members sought without success to secure an agreement from the chairman on a firm date to close the hearings and to start executive sessions on the bill so as to act on it and report the measure to the House in ample time for consideration before the adjournment. Despite his previous assurances of prompt action, the chairman declined to make such an agreement. In fact, he even declined to give any assurance that the members of the committee themselves would have an opportunity to vote in executive session on whether to report the bill out. When he was questioned on this point, the chairman replied:

> I am not in a position to state at this moment what the procedure is going to be because I do not know myself.

And at another point, the chairman stated:

> I think we should in all fairness to the opposition, if we are not going to report out this bill, give them notice soon enough so that those who desire to get a petition to discharge the committee will have a reasonable opportunity to do so.

I am sure that most of the Members of this body have read the numerous newspaper stories published during the past few days to the effect that the Republican leadership of the House has decided to kill the public housing title of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and has served notice that no bill containing public housing will come to a vote in the House at this session.

Are these stories true? I do not know, for the Republican leadership has not taken me into its confidence. But I will say that all these events have an ominous and familiar ring of plausibility. It is not beyond reason to believe that the Republican leadership of the House is against public housing. And it is not beyond reason that the leadership is fearful that if public housing is permitted to come to a vote on the floor of the House, a majority of the Members of the House would support it and would pass it. Faced with the acute housing shortage and with the necessity for confronting the electorate this fall, many Republican Members might well vote for public housing if they were given the opportunity of doing so, particularly since the only real opponent of public housing is the real-estate lobby. And while the real-estate lobby has plenty of money, it does not control many votes among the electorate.

I note that the distinguished Speaker of the House is quoted in yesterday's Washington Post as having stated in Chicago that housing legislation will be passed at this session of Congress. But what kind of housing legislation? Apparently the Speaker did not elucidate. Did he have in mind the kind of housing legislation sought by the real-estate lobby to underwrite the profits of speculative builders on overpriced houses? Or did he have in mind housing legislation such as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which would give hope to the millions of veterans and other families, now living in slums or crowded in with in-laws, that eventually they may secure decent homes in which they can bring up their families with some degree of security and self-respect?

I think the Members of this body are entitled to know what the plans of the leadership are on housing legislation.

There will be claim that this House has already done all that is essential and can be done to assure maximum production of housing. I should like to examine the

record as to what needs to be done, as to what this House has done, and as to what would be possible of attainment under the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

The issue before us is not how much housing will be produced this year or even next year—we have had short periods of high building activity before, but our housing problem remains unsolved. The issue is whether this Nation is now going to lay the foundation for the kind of a sustained home-construction program that eventually will assure all Americans at least the minimum requirements for decent home life. This means not just a million new homes this year or next year, but a sustained production averaging 1,250,000 to 1,500,000 a year for the next 10 to 15 years. This means two and one-half to three times as much new housing as was produced during the average year before the war.

This kind of production will not be sustained by merely letting the cream be lapped off of today's market—that has been tried before, with disastrous results to the domestic economy and the American people. It will only be achieved by embarking now on long-term housing measures to alleviate the conditions which, in the past, have created the extreme fluctuations in housing production.

The requirements of a long-term housing program are measures which will help the building industry reduce costs, assure a steadily expanding flow of credit, provide aid to local communities for the clearance of slums and the provision of decent housing for low-income families and make available loans and subsidies for the improvement of farm housing. There is nothing new or mysterious about these principles, except to the real-estate lobby and apparently the majority members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

These principles have been outlined as the result of every congressional investigation of the housing problem over the past 4 years. And I call the attention of the House to the fact that every one of the 16 legislative recommendations of the Joint Committee on Housing in its final report to the Congress is incorporated in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. In fact, that bill in the revised form in which it passed the Senate is in essence the legislative expression of the Joint Committee on Housing's recommendations.

The Congress has a $100,000 investment in the Joint Committee on Housing. When the resolution establishing that committee was being debated last July, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee supported it strongly and said:

> We will know from now on, we hope, where we are going in respect to housing and how we can lick the housing shortage.

Well, the $100,000 has been spent, the joint committee has completed an exhaustive investigation of housing, it has submitted its report to the Congress, and all its legislative recommendations are embodied in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill now bottled up in the Banking and Currency Committee.

The joint committee, I am advised, was practically unanimous about the effects of costs on the housing problem. The principal reason that we do not have enough decent homes today is that not enough people have been able to afford the dwellings that were produced. This was as true in 1928 and 1938 at different general price levels as it is in 1948. The joint committee found many reasons for this situation, such as building codes and restrictive practices, but they all add up to the primary fact that housing is still produced by handicraft methods which have prevailed for generations, without the benefits of modern technology. The committee decided that a rapid conversion to modern industrial methods could be accomplished only with Government aids in the form of financing of research and special forms of credit for those employing mass-production methods.

This House has followed some of these recommendations in voting to extend title VI of the National Housing Act until March 31, 1949, with certain amendments.

These provisions which are also a part of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, are helpful, but they omit what the joint committee reported as the greatest possibility for the progressive reduction of housing costs—technical research. Title III of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill would provide such a program under direction of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This title conveys broad authority for technical and market research; the extent to which this authority could be used would be determined annually by the Congress through its control of appropriations. On the technical side, the Administrator would be authorized to undertake a research program with respect to research to develop, demonstrate, and promote new and improved techniques, materials, and methods which would permit progressive reductions in cost. I am confident that the memory of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is fresh enough in our minds to illustrate what can be done with a program which coordinates the knowledge on a subject and seeks its definite application. The same principles would apply on an infinitely smaller scale in housing, in which there is presently a lack of any central agency, outside of Government, of sufficient size or scope to utilize the research method effectively. The credit aids provided elsewhere in this bill will bring much more effective results if producers, prefabricators, and mass builders have the benefits of sustained programs of technical research and have the facilities in which their own developments can be tested.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have heard a great deal of concern about inflationary sources of credit. So I am rather amazed with the indications that the majority leadership, therefore, may be seeking to limit the entire housing legislation program for this session to the extension of title VI mortgage insurance already voted by the House in H. R. 5854. This is an emergency measure originally enacted to stimulate war housing. The joint committee has reported and administration leaders have testified that it should be discontinued as quickly as the transition to more permanent credit aids can be effected. It is a type of Government credit assistance which has come in for considerable criticism in the majority report by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, signed by the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee. It is true that some inflationary aspects have been modified in H. R. 5854, such as the elimination of the "necessary current cost" basis for determining insurable loans on housing built for sale and, on urgently needed rental housing, the pegging of mortgage insurance to costs as of December 31, 1947. But no benchmarks of permanent credit aids to which home building and home finance can be adjusted during this transition period are provided. Furthermore, no credit aids responsive to the growing interest of veterans in cooperative housing enterprises would be made available.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill would establish these benchmarks. It would provide liberal credit aids for veterans' and other cooperatives. Furthermore, it would further encourage rental housing and, in line with the joint committee's recommendations to stimulate production at lower costs, would offer incentives, in addition to those to mass producers I have already enumerated, for the financing of housing in the lower-price ranges.

Thus, title I of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill would not only extend title VI of the National Housing Act until March 31 next year with certain amendments to limit its inflationary effects, but it would also bring the permanent title II mortgage insurance provisions of this act, which have been largely inoperative with respect to new housing since the beginning of the war, up to date by revising the cost limitations in line with present realities. At the same time it would further encourage production of homes for lower-income families by permitting insurance of 30-year, 4-percent mortgages covering 90 percent of the value, if the principal does not exceed $6,000, and up to 95 percent of the value if this would not contribute to inflationary pressures.

Under title IV of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, further encouragement would be given to the production of rental housing for the large segment of our population which does not find it feasible to enter into home ownership. The lack of an adequate supply of rental housing has contributed to inflationary pressures by forcing thousands of families into involuntary ownership under prices and terms they can ill afford. Under this title, mortgage insurance would be available for 40-year, 4-percent rental housing loans covering 90 percent of value. Similar terms would be available to cooperatives and, in the case of veterans' groups, mortgage insurance could cover 95 percent of the value of the property. Veterans who have been unable to find adequate housing at prices they can afford are becoming increasingly interested in forming cooperatives by which they can take care of their own housing problems under the advantages of large-scale production. This title would assure liberal financing for such cooperative ventures.

Another source of investment funds for the provision of rental housing would be tapped under title IV of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, through its provisions for insurance of yield on debt-free investment. Under this plan, the FHA would insure a net return, after allowance for amortization, of 2¾ percent on the outstanding investment in projects undertaken under this plan, but rents would be established to permit a return of 3½ to 5 percent. This plan has been developed for sources of capital, such as insurance companies and trust funds, which are interested in obtaining an assured long-term return on investments rather than speculative profits. I have heard criticisms to the effect that the yield insurance provisions will not be used. These are largely the same voices that said that FHA mortgage insurance would not be used when it was first made available in 1934. Experience has established FHA mortgage insurance as a permanent part of our home-financing system, and I am convinced experience will do the same with yield insurance.

One more thing is needed to assure a steady flow of investment funds for the provision of privately financed housing—an adequate secondary market within Government for insured or guaranteed mortgages. Here again this House has taken halfway measures by extending the Federal National Mortgage Association for another year within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This agency performed a useful function, at a subsequent profit to the Government, in the early days of the FHA, before its type of financing obtained wide acceptance, by purchasing insured mortgages made by local lending institutions. It has recently resumed activity with the tightening of the money market. But there no longer exists within Government a secondary market for GI loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. Without the liquidity provided by a secondary market, lending institutions are refusing to make GI loans in many parts of the country.

Title II of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill fills this gap by providing, within the Housing and Home Finance Agency, a National Home Mortgage Corporation which would take over the functions of the FNMA and also have authority to purchase GI guaranteed loans. The borrowing power of this corporation would be limited to a maximum of $500,000,000 and its operations would be carefully limited to cases where a Government secondary market is necessary in order to maintain housing construction and where such a market would not contribute to inflationary pressures.

In the major areas of the housing problem on which I have thus far spoken, the problems of cost and credit, I think I have demonstrated the differences between the stopgap piecemeal measures which have been reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee and acted upon by the House and the well-rounded program contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

This House has passed bills that might continue for a time, a moderately high level of building at prices beyond the paying ability of most Americans. It has not had the chance to consider legislation which will assure the development of a sustained private building program that will begin to serve American housing needs and contribute to a stable home-building industry.

Now I turn to those equally basic phases of the housing problem, which have not been touched by legislative proposals on which this House has acted. Their solution is essential to any comprehensive legislation; they are provided for in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

First is the problem of urban slums. I am not going to repeat what all of you know about the evils of the slums. I am going to say that it is time this country does something effective about eliminating these conditions which drag down the health and morale of our citizens and threaten the economic solvency of our cities. I know what can be done, for I have seen what slum clearance and well-planned rebuilding have done on the hills of Pittsburgh.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill would tackle the problem of slums and bad housing through two separate but related programs. The first would be the provision of loans and grants to local communities for slum clearance. The other would be the extension of annual subsidies to local communities for the provision of decent housing for low-income families who cannot by any stretch of the imagination afford decent private housing.

The Federal participation in slum clearance provided in title V would be loans to help local communities finance such undertakings, and grants on a 2-to-1 matching basis, to help them absorb the difference between the cost of slum land, with its old improvements, and its value for redevelopment on sound planning principles. A 5-year program calling for $1,000,000,000 in repayable loans and $500,000,000 in grants is provided in title V. Adequate provision for the rehousing of families moved from the sites would be required.

The removal of slums alone will not provide good housing for low-income families unable to afford anything better. All of us hope and expect that eventually private enterprise, with the aids provided elsewhere in this bill, will be able to take care of a greater part of the housing need. But there is no prospect that private enterprise will be able to provide decent housing for low-income families now residing in slums. So, in title VI of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, the successful public-housing program started under the United States Housing Act of 1937 would be extended to 500,000 additional families. Federal participation would be limited to the annual contributions which, with local tax exemption, are necessary to reduce rents to the level which low-income families can afford to pay. No additional loan funds are provided, since it is anticipated that with the financing amendments contained in this bill local housing authorities would be able to raise all capital funds in the private bond market. The increase in annual subsidies which would be authorized under the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill would amount to a maximum of $160,000,000 after 5 years, payable for a period not exceeding 40 years.

Furthermore, in recognition of the particularly pressing housing needs of veterans, first preference in occupancy of this low-rent housing would be extended to veterans of World War II, and particularly to disabled veterans.

Under title VII of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, Congress, for the first time in American history, would direct its attention specifically to alleviating the bad housing conditions on the farm. This problem in rural areas is complicated by the relationship of the house to the farm as a unit of production. I think comprehensive housing legislation should deal with rural housing, and bolstered by the advice of my rural colleagues, I am persuaded that this program developed with the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture establishes a reasonable basis for tackling the problem.

This program is directed principally to the provision of decent housing on farms which are presently or potentially capable of providing adequate incomes. The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to make 33-year 4-percent loans. On potentially adequate farms, contributions in the form of a credit not to exceed the interest and half the annual payment of principal, would be permitted for 10 years. Loans and grants, not to exceed $1,000 per unit, would be available for minor improvements to housing located on farms not eligible for the other provisions of this act when necessary to bring them up to minimum health standards.

The loan authorization is $250,000,000 for 4 years, the maximum rate of contributions is $5,000,000 per year and the grants for minor repairs may not exceed $12,500,000.

Mr. Speaker, I think it has been clearly demonstrated that the only real housing program which is before the Congress is that contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It is the only program which provides adequate incentives and tools by which private enterprise can do a more effective job of serving America's housing needs, not only this year and next year, but over the next 10 to 15 years. It is the only program that promises to do anything about the unspeakable living conditions of the slums. It is the only program that offers any hope to the low-income families in our cities and towns and on the farms for decent homes in which to live and rear children.

This is basically the same program that has been before this Congress for nearly 3 years. It is basically the same program that has been recommended by the Joint Committee on Housing, in which Congress invested $100,000 of the taxpayers' money, after hearings held in Washington and 32 other cities. The 3 weeks of testimony held by the Banking and Currency Committee have produced no testimony either for or against this program which has not already been repeated time and time again in the thousands of words of testimony and exhibits available to the Members of this Congress.

The citizens of the United States who are going through the heartbreaking search for a place to live, who daily face the task of extracting some decency out of indecent places in which to live, have a right to know what this Congress expects to do about housing. They have a right to know whether this Congress intends to embark on a housing program that will meet the needs of the American people, or whether it will continue to do only what the powerful but short-sighted real estate lobby wants it to do.

There is still ample time for the Congress to act before this session adjourns. The Banking and Currency Committee can quickly conclude its hearings on S. 866. It can utilize the wealth of material already available to it for the preparation of a report so that this House, in accordance with the pledge given by its chairman, will have an opportunity to debate this bill and vote it up or down. In view of the statement quoted at the beginning of this speech, and of other public statements of the chairman, I think this House and the people of the United States have a right to know today when and if this committee expects to report on this matter.

But I must express serious misgivings about the intentions of the chairman of the committee and of the Republican leadership of the House on this matter. Last week, the committee held only 1 day of hearings on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. This week, the committee held hearings Monday morning but the further hearings scheduled for Tuesday and Wednesday were canceled. Of course there are excuses—the House was meeting early or there were other measures which the committee had to consider. But if there were a real resolve or intention on the part of the leadership to get this vitally important measure on the floor for a vote, ways could be found to expedite and complete the hearings, without further delay.

There is a positive way by which the Members of this House can get an opportunity to express their will on this matter. That is to discharge this committee, and bring the matter directly to the floor for action. Many Members of this House already have signed discharge petition No. 6 now on the rostrum which would bring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to the floor. I know that other Members have hesitated to sign until there has been a full opportunity for consideration and a report by the committee. But the time is late and the events I have recited have thrown serious doubt on whether the House will ever be permitted to vote on this measure at this session through the normal committee procedures. It is time for every Member of this House who really wants to vote on comprehensive housing legislation this year to get his name on that petition. The American people will not be fooled. They will interpret every name which is not on that petition as a vote against the only legislation that gives assurance of decent homes within the paying ability of all American families.

In conclusion, I would like to read to the House a brief editorial which appeared in the May 25 issue of the New York Times, a conservative and highly respected newspaper if there ever was one. It is very much to the point of this discussion and it reads as follows:

LET'S HAVE A VOTE ON HOUSING

There are disturbing reports from Washington that measures embodying a comprehensive long-range housing program again may be lost in the shuffle of last-minute legislative deliberations. There is danger that all of the debates, hearings, and studies which have been inspired by the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill may go for naught, and that the measure may not even be reported out of committee unless some congressional leaders cease their filibustering and delaying tactics. A group of influential Members have been quoted as saying at this late hour that they will not support the bill unless all its provisions relating to public housing are eliminated.

In their zeal for the cause of private enterprise, these legislators appear to have overlooked the obvious fact that speculative builders and investors never have met, and never will meet, the urgent need for decent shelter for millions of low-income familiies, and that Government aid to fill this gap has become a recognized social and economic necessity.

In this election year, and in the face of a continued shortage, it is deplorable that housing should have become a political football. No worthy purpose could be served by further delay. It is high time that Members of Congress should have an opportunity to show how they stand on this important question.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article entitled "Housing," appearing in the American Legion National Legionnaire for May 1948, to be included along with my remarks:

HOUSING

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.—Having agreed to support the amended Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, now that it provides definite priorities for veterans, the American Legion was moving to add its own amendments to the legislation to make it a real veterans' housing measure.

Endorsement of the bill was voted by the national executive committee of the American Legion on the recommendation of Walter E. Alessandroni, of Philadelphia, Pa., chairman of the National Housing Committee.

The favorable action came after National Commander James F. O'Neil personally took the floor and made a dramatic plea for adoption of Chairman Alessandroni's report.

In its resolution on the TEW bill, the NEC directed that the American Legion, through its national legislative director, immediately present to Congress further amendments to the measure to incorporate in it all the provisions of its own Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948.

Chairman Alessandroni told the NEC that the TEW bill (S. 866) as amended by Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont, and passed by the Senate on April 22, provided definite priorities for veterans and thus removed the chief ground for American Legion objections to the measure.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

The NEC adopted the following resolution on the TEW bill as submitted by Chairman Alessandroni:

"Whereas for 2 years veterans have desperately needed adequate, reasonably priced housing; and

"Whereas the Congress, public agencies, and private enterprise have been unsuccessful in providing sufficient quantities of such housing for veterans; and

"Whereas the American Legion Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948 (H. R. 4488) provides the best means of providing such housing for veterans; and

"Whereas, the TEW bill, as amended by Senator FLANDERS in conformance with the report of the Joint Congressional Investigation Committee on Housing, has cured many of the objectionable defects of the previous TEW bill; and

"Whereas the Flanders amendments do not provide the aid for veterans' housing as contemplated by the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948 and therefore the measure is deficient as an omnibus housing bill by failing to provide sufficiently for the veterans: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Director of the National Legislative Commission be directed to present to the Congress further amendments to Senator FLANDERS' amendments to the TEW bill to incorporate therein the provisions of the Veterans' Homestead Act as modified by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee print, dated March 28, 1948, and; be it finally

"*Resolved*, That the national executive committee of the American Legion, in meeting duly assembled * * * hereby goes on record in support of the action contained in the first resolving clause above set forth and orders specific compliance."

O'NEIL STATEMENT

National Commander O'Neil vigorously supported Chairman Alessandroni. He said, in part:

"I have traveled some 83,000 miles since September 1. I have had an opportunity to talk with thousands of veterans, Legionnaires and non-Legionnaires, about this subject of housing. I have made it a point to do so. This is the most urgent issue before the country today, as it affects veterans.

"I don't think we can ever stand in very good grace before anybody if we are willing to accept Federal subsidies for ourselves and indicate we want them denied to anybody else. I don't think we want to stand in that position.

"I find myself in accord with the report of your housing committee as submitted through your National Economic Commission in this resolution. I say to you this is a critical period and if you delay it, and continue to delay it, in the hopes you are going to postpone the day, you are only kidding yourself. Very frankly, you are kidding yourself and the Legion if you assume that position. This is critical to the veteran who is in need of housing. Some of them have been forced to double up. All of us here are in comfortable circumstances, or most of us are, but I want you to think about the veteran who is forced to double up with others. He finds himself, because of economic conditions, looking to rental housing. He can't get it. He is looking to the American Legion for assistance and we want to duck behind something that is not really the issue. I say to you, in my opinion we can take action here without violating any of the resolutions or mandates of the national organization as they relate to housing."

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 83. An act authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 107. An act for the relief of William B. Buol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 424. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John J. Higgins, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 660. An act for the relief of Peter Drozd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 709. An act for the relief of Carlos Riggenbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 873. An act for the relief of Warren H. McKenney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 933. An act for the relief of Emanual Carinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1035. An act to provide for the acquisition of the hospital at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., and Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa, for use as domiciliary facilities by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 1303. An act for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Hou Chung Chay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1364. An act for the relief of Kihei Matsuo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1409. An act for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1476. An act to require the designation by the senior circuit judge of another judge to sit in the place of any judge against whom an affidavit of personal bias and prejudice has been filed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1504. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others", approved March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 891), as amended by the act of November 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 1036); to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1573. An act for the relief of Marcella Kosterman; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1747. An act to authorize credit in certain accounts of United States property and disbursing officers under the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1835. An act for the relief of Harry Daniels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1964. An act for the relief of Walter Werner Tech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1987. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Preston Bench project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2040; an act for the relief of the owners of certain properties abutting Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2059. An act for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2215. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the heart and circulation, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2237. An act to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 2251. An act to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States naval hospital, United States naval training center, Great Lakes, Ill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2254. An act authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Fort Robinson Military Reservation to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2406. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2440. An act for the relief of Charles Duncan Montieth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2454. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make further provision for the recording of title to, interests in, and encumbrances upon certain aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2455. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by limiting the liability of certain persons not in possession of aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2456. An act to provide safety in aviation and to direct a study of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms and other atmospheric disturbances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2496. An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2508. An act relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2592. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico, in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government, and final judgments in certain condemnation proceedings; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2593. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia a right-of-way for public-highway purposes in certain lands at Pungo, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to grant free postage to members of the armed forces while confined for treatment in a military or naval hospital, and to veterans while being furnished hospital treatment or institutional care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 183. An act to transfer lot 1 in block 115, city of Fairbanks, Alaska, to the city of Fairbanks, Alaska.

H. R. 350. An act for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.

H. R. 892. An act for the relief of Michel Ferapontow;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Dora Greenbaum (Brenner);

H. R. 1608. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1338);

H. R. 1916. An act for the relief of Filiberto A. Bonaventura;

H. R. 2218. An act for the relief of Lawrence Edgar Edwards;

H. R. 2384. An act for the relief of Colbert H. Cannon;

H. R. 2760. An act for relief of Thomas Camarda;

H. R. 3344. An act to amend the fourth paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322); 48 U. S. C. sec. 101, as amended;

H. R. 3358. An act for the relief of Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang and Dr. Esther Chang Liang;

H. R. 3526. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret K. Cahn;

H. R. 3578. An act to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3603. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other;

H. R. 3633. An act to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available home lands;

H. R. 3635. An act to ratify sections 1 and 2 of Joint Resolution 7, enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in its regular session of 1947;

H. R. 3640. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte D. Wang, Harvey S. P. Wang, and Arthur Y. P. Wang.

H. R. 3644. An act for the relief of James M. Dingwall, Jr.; Aileen Reynolds; Bert Woolslayer; and Mrs. Maisie Purser Davis;

H. R. 3730. An act to amend section 20 (12) of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to recourse, by an initial or delivering carrier, against the carrier on whose line loss of, or damage or injury to, property is sustained, on account of expense incurred in defending actions at law.

H. R. 3954. An act to approve Act No. 74 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to revenue bonds of the Territory of Hawaii," and Act No. 95 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to Territorial and county public improvements and the financing thereof by the issuance of revenue bonds";

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of John H. Schmitt and Mrs. Mildred Schmitt;

H. R. 4091. An act to ratify Act 237 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947;

H. R. 4201. An act to authorize payments to the public-school district or districts serving the Fort Peck project, Montana, for the education of dependents of persons engaged on that project;

H. R. 4377. An act for the relief of the Consolidated Steel Corp. of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 4379. An act for the relief of the Harbor Boat Building Co.; the Wilmington Welding & Boiler Works; and the B & R Machine Works, of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 4393. An act to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4426. An act to provide basic authority for certain functions and activities of the Weather Bureau, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4443. An act for the relief of Jacob Cohen;

H. R. 4484. An act for the relief of Theodore Loetsch;

H. R. 4512. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the State of Oklahoma for the use and benefit of the Northeastern State Teachers College at Tahlequah, Okla.;

H. R. 4513. An act to eliminate the requirement of oaths in certain land matters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4551. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4593. An act for the relief of Abraham Spevak;

H. R. 4672. An act for the relief of John Cameron Henry;

H. R. 4804. An act to allow service credit for certain enlisted men of the Coast Guard who acted as policemen and guards at the Ivigtut Cryolite Mine, Greenland, during 1940 and 1941;

H. R. 4817. An act to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.);

H. R. 4823. An act to provide adequate school facilities within Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5122. An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512);

H. R. 5173. An act to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available home lands;

H. R. 5175. An act to confirm and ratify Act 205 of the session laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to the issuance of public-improvement bonds;

H. R. 5244. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II";

H. R. 5298. An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5836. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army or his duly authorized representative to quitclaim a perpetual easement over certain lands adjacent to the Fort Meyers Army Airfield, Fla.;

H. R. 5839. An act to authorize the conveyance to States, or political subdivisions, of roads leading to certain historical areas administered by the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5870. An act to amend the act of May 16, 1946 (Public Law 383, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide increased allowances for the escorts of repatriated war dead;

H. R. 5901. An act to provide for the distribution among the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming of the receipts of the Colorado River Development Fund for use in the fiscal years 1949 to 1955, inclusive, on a basis which is as nearly equal as practicable and to make available other funds for the investigtion and construction of projects in any of the States of Colorado River Basin in addition to appropriations for said purposes from the Colorado River Development Fund;

H. R. 5922. An act relating to the issuance of reentry permits, to certain aliens;

H. R. 6203. An act to incorporate the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington in corporation sole;

H. R. 6209. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the District of Columbia", approved January 6, 1893, as amended;

H. R. 6302. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, to permit the exercise of certain options on or before August 8, 1950;

H. J. Res. 339. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp series in honor of volunteer firemen;

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the golden anniversary of the consolidation of the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond, which boroughs now comprise New York City;

H. J. Res. 379. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1949;

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1949.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1006. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, and the Potassium Act of February 7, 1927, in order to promote the development of certain minerals on the public domain; and for other purposes;

S. 2256. An act relating to the meat-inspection service of the Department of Agriculture; and

S. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1948, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 183. An act to transfer lot 1 in block 115, city of Fairbanks, Alaska, to the city of Fairbanks, Alaska;

H. R. 350. An act for relief of Caffey-Robertson-Smith, Inc.;

H. R. 892. An act for relief of Michel Ferapontow;

H. R. 926. An act for relief of Dora Greenbaum (Brenner).

H. R. 1608. An act to amend "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska";

H. R. 1916. An act for relief of Filiberto A. Bonventura;

H. R. 2218. An act for relief of Lawrence Edgar Edwards;

H. R. 2384. An act for relief of Colbert H. Cannon;

H. R. 2760. An act for relief of Thomas Camarda;

H. R. 3344. An act to amend Alaska civil government act, as amended;

H. R. 3358. An act for relief of Drs. Timothy C. H. Liang and Esther Chang Liang;

H. R. 3526. An act for relief of Mrs. Margaret K. Cahn.

H. R. 3578. An act to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge, Mass.

H. R. 3603. An act granting consent to Idaho and Wyoming to enter into Snake River compact;

H. R. 3633. An act to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available home lands;

H. R. 3635. An act to ratify sections 1 and 2 of Joint Resolution 7 enacted by Hawaii Legislature;

H. R. 3640. An act for relief of Mrs. Charlotte D. Wang and others;

H. R. 3644. An act for relief of James M. Dingwall and others.

H. R. 3730. An act to amend section 20 (12) of the Interstate Commerce Act;

H. R. 3954. An act to approve Act No. 74 and Act. No. 95 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 3965. An act for relief of John H. Schmitt and Mrs. Mildred Schmitt;

H. R. 4091. An act to ratify Act 237 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1947;

H. R. 4201. An act to authorize payments to public school districts serving Fort Peck;

H. R. 4377. An act for relief of Consolidated Steel Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 4379. An act for relief of Harbor Boat Building Co.; the Wilmington Welding and Boiler Works; and B. & R. Machine Works, of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 4393. An act to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

H. R. 4426. An act to provide basic authority for certain functions of the Weather Bureau;

H. R. 4443. An act for relief of Jacob Cohen.

H. R. 4484. An act for relief of Theodore Loetsch;

H. R. 4512. An act to convey certain Oklahoma lands to Northeastern State College, Tahlequah;

H. R. 4513. An act to eliminate the requirement of oaths in certain land matters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4551. An act to provide for addition of surplus Government lands to Cape Hatteras project;

H. R. 4593. An act for relief of Abraham Spevak;

H. R. 4672. An act for relief of John Cameron Henry.

H. R. 4804. An act to allow service credit for certain enlisted men of Coast Guard who acted as policemen at Ivigtut Cryolite Mine, Greenland, in 1940 and 1941.

H. R. 4817. An act to amend act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409);

H. R. 4823. An act to provide adequate school facilities within Yellowstone Park.

H. R. 5122. An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512);

H. R. 5173. An act to amend section 203 of Hawaiian Homes Commission Act;

H. R. 5175. An act to ratify Act 205 of 1947 Hawaii Session Laws;

H. R. 5244. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II";

H. R. 5836. An act to authorize Secretary of Army to quitclaim a perpetual easement over certain lands adjacent to the Fort Myers Army Airfield, Fla.;

H. R. 5839. An act to authorize conveyance to States of roads leading to certain historical areas administered by Interior Department;

H. R. 5870. An act to amend act of May 16, 1946 (Public. 383, 79th Cong.);

H. R. 5901. An act to provide for distribution of receipts of the Colorado River Development Fund;

H. R. 5922. An act relating to the issuance of reentry permits to certain aliens;

H. R. 6203. An act to incorporate the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington;

H. R. 6209. An act to amend Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation Incorporation Act;

H. R. 6302. An act to amend Mineral Leasing Act of 1920;

H. J. Res. 339. Joint resolution on issuance of special postage stamp series in honor of volunteer firemen;

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution on special stamp commemorative of golden anniversary of consolidation of the five boroughs comprising Greater New York.

H. J. Res. 379. Joint resolution to provide for maintenance of public order during 1949 inaugural;

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution to grant permits to Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies for January 1949; and

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to provide for quartering in certain public buildings in

the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1949.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 27, 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:

1589. A communication from the President of the United States, expressing his earnest hope that the House of Representatives will take favorable action at this session upon legislation providing Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools (H. Doc. No. 677); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

1590. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949, in the amount of $19,155,000, for care, handling, and disposal of surplus property abroad (H. Doc. No. 678); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1591. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $158,686,100 for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 679); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1592. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of a submarine chaser for use in the Valley Forge Military Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1593. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a contract by and between the United States and the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation as provided for by Public Law 296, Eightieth Congress, first session; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1594. A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1595. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 30, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of St. Marys River, Ga., and Fla., and North River, Ga., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945, and also authorized under the provisions of House Document No. 308, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, which was enacted into law, with modifications, in section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved on January 21, 1927 (H. Doc. No. 680); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with five illustrations.

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. JENSEN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6705. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2038). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3685. A bill authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma, through its business committee, to sell and convey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Wyandotte Indian public burial ground in Kansas City, Kans.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2039). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6623. A bill to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2041). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1871. An act to restore certain lands to the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2042). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1933. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to school district 55, Roosevelt County, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2043). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6457. A bill to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martenez Indian Reservations; with amendments (Rept. No. 2045). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Twelfth intermediate report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to ascertain scope of interpretation by general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board; without amendment (Rept. No. 2050). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 615. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 6705, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2052). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6696. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to standards of safety and sanitation in the case of certain cars and equipment used in the movement of express traffic or baggage; without amendment (Rept. No. 2053). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. J. Res. 412. Joint resolution to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to strengthen the American merchant marine, to encourage investment in the American merchant marine to build more ships, and to remove inequities; without amendment (Rept. No. 2054). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. J. Res. 413. Joint resolution to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2055). 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. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5147. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Florence A. W. Arens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2040). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1941. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John F. Compton, formerly John Crazy Bull, a patent in fee to certain land; without amendment (Rept. No. 2044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Res. 606. Resolution referring the bill H. R. 1171 to the Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4702. A bill for the relief of J. W. Greenwood, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2047). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4830. A bill for the relief of Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5421. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles L. Stover; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2049). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6704. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 6705. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 6706. A bill for the relief of certain veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6707. A bill to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6708. A bill authorizing the construction of flood-control work on the Red River of the North, Minn., and N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6709. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York a perpetual easement in, over, and upon a 0.29-acre parcel of land at New York Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6710. A bill to extend to January 1, 1950, certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the compensation of military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6711. A bill to amend Public Law 195, Eightieth Congress (ch. 258, 1st sess.), entitled "An act to provide revenue for the

District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6712. A bill to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6713. A bill to authorize a further preliminary examination and a new survey of the Spring Creek, North and South Branches, which flows into the Marsh River, a tributary of the Red River of the North, Norman County, State of Minnesota, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 6714. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6715. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 to include the State of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS (by request):

H. R. 6716. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 6717. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of the reclamation fund for the cost of the construction and certain costs of operation and maintenance of the Colorado River front work and levee system adjacent to the Yuma Federal irrigation project in Arizona and California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 207. Concurrent resolution to suspend commercial relations with Lebanon; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Con. Res. 208. Concurrent resolution suspending commercial relations between the United States and Lebanon; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 6718. A bill for the relief of Jeptha R. Macfarlane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 6719. A bill for the relief of Manuel Barrios, his wife, Elvira Barrios, and infant son, Gerardo Barrios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6720. A bill for the relief of Fe'R. Dumaguing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 6721. A bill for the relief of Anthony Lazanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6722. A bill to authorize the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to hear and determine a motion for a new trial for Thomas Jordon; 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:

2017. By Mr. HART: Petition of Union City Post, No. 46, of the American Legion, protesting further shipment of potential war materials to the Soviet Union and its satellite nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2018. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of the German Sick Beneficial Society of Mansfield, Ohio, with reference to the amendment of House bill 6163; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2019. By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Petition of Wirt Henry Ferguson urging Congress to establish a policy to halt aggressive expansion of the present Russian Government and its satellites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2020. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Frank Kish and others, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

2021. Also, petition of Micheal T. Nevaloney and others, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of legislation which would provide for the admission of our share of displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2022. Also, petition of Glendale American Legion Post, No. 127, California, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of legislation for increase in compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 20, 1948)

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

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

Lord Jesus, as Thou dost move among people and see what men are doing today, how sore must be Thy heart.

Thou whose head was cradled in straw must often reflect that straw was not as coarse as man's selfishness.

Thou whose hands were spread upon a cross and fastened with nails must often reflect that nails were never so sharp as man's ingratitude.

Hear us as we pray for this poor blundering world, in which the nations never seem to learn how to live as brothers.

They resort again and again to methods that produce only more bitter tears, methods that only add to misery and subtract nothing from problems.

Heal them that need healing, make strong the wavering, guide the perplexed, befriend the lonely, give new faith and courage to those whose spirits are low.

Lift up our heads, put a new light in our eyes and a new song in our hearts, and we will do better and be better for the sake of Thy love. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Wednesday, May 26, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 26, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following act:

S. 1979. An act authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell and hard-shell clams.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6407) to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, Mr. LEA, and Mr. PRIEST were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5874) to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6071) to provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6096. An act making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6659. An act to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

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;

H. R. 3731. An act authorizing modifications in the repayment contracts with the Lower Yellowstone Irrigation District No. 1 and the Lower Yellowstone Irrigation District No. 2;

H. R. 3785. An act to authorize the State of Minnesota to condemn lands owned by the United States in the county of Cass, State of Minnesota, for fish propagation, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5874. An act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

(The following request by Mr. FERGUSON was inadvertently omitted from the RECORD of Wednesday, May 26, 1948:)

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Government Corporations of the Committee